

to do the best we can. We ought to take up some of these bills that are going to die and pass them before the 4th of March, and then at the special session pass this bill, together with any appropriation bills that we are unable to pass before March 4, and we will get this bill through just as quickly and we will save the other things that I have mentioned and several others that I have not mentioned, besides saving ourselves.

It seems to me, therefore, Mr. President, we might as well face the reality that every man must know exists. It seems to me the easiest thing in the world is to conduct a filibuster, with the large number of men engaged in it who are engaged in this, from now to the 4th of March. There may be some dead Senators along the way, but we might overlook that. However, we ought not to overlook the fact that when the 4th of March comes we will have nothing done, and the other way we will accomplish something. But when the extra session comes I am going to do all I can to get this bill enacted into law, and I will be glad to assist in every way I can. I only want to suggest—this is only my judgment, and I may be wrong—that when the extra session comes and you take up this bill again you ought to bring it before the Senate without any coercion, without any restraint, and without any caucus rule behind it. There are a good many men over here in favor of a great many, at least, of the principles enunciated in this bill. There are men—and it is perfectly natural that it should be so—who, when you make a bill partisan and in a secret caucus say "We will vote down every amendment that a Republican may offer"—it is natural, I say, that men should resent that kind of conduct and come into the Senate with an unfriendly feeling; men who ought to be with you; men who believe in many of the same things that you do, driven away by caucus action.

I have tried in this case, Senators, not to let such a thing influence me. If it has, I have been unconscious of it. But I want to say that it has been humiliating to know that when I honestly and conscientiously favored some amendment and wanted to bring about the enactment of the fundamental principles that are in this bill, I had always to be told, "The caucus will have to pass on it first." Members of this body—not one, but many—said, "I believe you are right on that proposition." Many of them said "I think both the amendments you have suggested are right, but the caucus must pass on them first."

Why not let this bill come out like the Trade Commission bill? You have boasted of that bill all over the United States. It came out without a caucus rule. You got a good many votes on this side of the Chamber, and no man will honestly deny but that you got valuable assistance on this side of the Chamber, particularly from the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], who was an expert on the subject, and who, without casting any reflection upon any other Senator, knew at least as much about the subject as any other Member of this body. If you had made a caucus measure of it you would have driven him to the other side; that is inevitable.

Now, Mr. President, I have said all I care to say. I am in earnest about it. I would be willing to come here night after night and keep this session up indefinitely if I knew that we could pass this bill by the 4th of March. But I do not believe there is a ghost of a show on earth to do it. There will not be such filibustering in the extra session, because the session will be unlimited. This filibuster is kept alive because they know that just a few days ahead of us is the time when the session must end.

Mr. NEWLANDS and Mr. O'GORMAN addressed the Chair.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. NORRIS. I will yield to the Senator first, and then I will yield to the Senator from Nevada if he desires.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I understood that the Senator had yielded the floor. I wish to take the floor at the close of his remarks.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York moves that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. FLETCHER and Mr. KERN called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THORNTON (when Mr. RANDELL's name was called). I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] is necessarily absent, and that he is paired with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS].

Mr. WEEKS (when his name was called). On this vote and for the day I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL]. I withhold my vote.

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 48, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—48.

Bankhead	Colt	Kenyon	Poin Dexter
Borah	Crawford	Lippitt	Root
Brady	Cummins	Lodge	Sherman
Brandeggee	Dillingham	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Bristow	du Pont	McLean	Smoot
Burleigh	Fall	Nelson	Stephenson
Burton	Gallinger	Norris	Sterling
Camden	Goff	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Catron	Gronna	Oliver	Townsend
Clapp	Hardwick	Page	Vardaman
Clark, Wyo.	Hitchcock	Penrose	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Perkins	Works

NAYS—46.

Ashurst	La Follette	Pomerene	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	Lane	Reed	Stone
Chamberlain	Lea, Tenn.	Robinson	Swanson
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Saulsbury	Thomas
Culberson	Lewis	Shafroth	Thompson
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Thornton
Gore	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Tillman
Hollis	Myers	Shively	Walsh
Hughes	Newlands	Simmons	White
James	Overman	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Johnson	Owen	Smith, Ga.	
Kern	Pittman	Smith, Md.	

NOT VOTING—2.

Ransdell Weeks

So the motion was agreed to, and (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m., Wednesday, February 10, 1915) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 11, 1915, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, February 8, 1915.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We lift up our hearts in gratitude to Thee, O God our Father, for all the great reforms which have come and which are coming under the influences of the higher civilization of our day which tends to bind the hearts of men into a common brotherhood. Especially do we thank Thee as American citizens for the gracious privilege vouchsafed to us by the Constitution of our Union, which removes all barriers, takes away all restrictions, and permits us to worship Thee according to the dictates of conscience. Thus by the light of an open Bible, and united under one flag, help us to move forward to yet greater attainments under the leadership of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, February 6, and Sunday, February 7, 1915, was read and approved.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, there is a portion of the Private Calendar which has never been called by unanimous consent. I would like to submit a request that on next Wednesday, at half past 5, the House stand in recess until 8 o'clock; that at 8 o'clock the House resume its session, to continue not later than 11:30; and that bills on the Private Calendar only be considered, beginning at the point where the call was concluded at the last meeting. I will also ask as a part of the request that bills be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that on next Wednesday the House at 5:30 o'clock take a recess until 8 o'clock; that the session shall not extend beyond 11:30 o'clock, for the consideration of all bills on the Private Calendar which are not objected to, beginning where the call left off at the last session; that no other business shall be transacted; and that the bills be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? There was no objection.

SUNDY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 21318, the sundry civil appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I hope that motion will not prevail. This is District day, and we have some important bills that ought to be passed. There is an abundance of time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes a privileged motion.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make a point of order that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 168, nays 106, not voting 149, as follows:

[Roll No. 58.]

YEAS—168.

Adair	Falconer	Igoe	Patton, Pa.
Alexander	Fergusson	Johnson, Utah	Phelan
Allen	Fitzgerald	Johnson, Wash.	Platt
Anderson	FitzHenry	Kahn	Plumley
Austin	Fordney	Keating	Pou
Baker	Foster	Kennedy, Iowa	Powers
Baltz	Fowler	Kettner	Rainey
Barnhart	Frear	Kirkald	Raker
Bartlett	French	Kirkpatrick	Rauch
Beakes	Gallagher	Knowland, J. R.	Reilly, Wis.
Beall, Tex.	Gard	Konop	Rogers
Booher	Gardner	Korbly	Rubey
Borchers	Garner	La Follette	Rucker
Brown, N. Y.	Gill	Langley	Russell
Brown, W. Va.	Gillett	Lenroot	Seldomridge
Brumbaugh	Goeke	Lieb	Sells
Buchanan, Tex.	Good	Lindbergh	Shackelford
Burke, S. Dak.	Gordon	Lloyd	Sherwood
Burke, Wis.	Goulden	McAndrews	Sinnott
Butler	Graham, Ill.	McKenzie	Sloan
Byrns, Tenn.	Gray	McLaughlin	Smith, J. M. C.
Calder	Green, Iowa	Madden	Smith, Minn.
Callaway	Greene, Mass.	Maguire, Nebr.	Smith, N. Y.
Campbell	Greene, Vt.	Mann	Steenerson
Casey	Guernsey	Mapes	Stephens, Cal.
Church	Hamilton, Mich.	Martin	Stephens, Nebr.
Ciancy	Hamilton, N. Y.	Miller	Stevens, Minn.
Cline	Hamlin	Mitchell	Stevens, N. H.
Cooper	Haugen	Mondell	Stone
Cox	Hawley	Morgan, Okla.	Stout
Cramton	Hayden	Morrison	Stringer
Curry	Helgesen	Moss, Ind.	Sutherland
Danforth	Helvering	Moss, W. Va.	Taggart
Decker	Hensley	Mott	Talcott, N. Y.
Dershem	Hinds	Neely, W. Va.	Thacher
Dickinson	Hinebaugh	Nelson	Treadway
Dies	Houston	Norton	Underhill
Dillon	Howell	Padgett	Underwood
Dixon	Hoxworth	Page, N. C.	Volmer
Doolittle	Hughes, W. Va.	Paige, Mass.	Volstead
Esch	Hull	Parker, N. J.	Wallin
Evans	Humphrey, Wash.	Patten, N. Y.	Whitacre

NAYS—106.

Abercrombie	Donovan	Kitchin	Slayden
Adamson	Doughton	Lazaro	Small
Aswell	Dupré	Lee, Ga.	Smith, Md.
Barkley	Eagle	Lee, Pa.	Smith, Tex.
Barton	Edwards	Lever	Stedman
Bell, Ga.	Estopinal	Linthicum	Stephens, Miss.
Blackmon	Fields	McGillcuddy	Stephens, Tex.
Brockson	Finley	McKellar	Taylor, Ala.
Broussard	Flood, Va.	MacDonald	Taylor, Ark.
Browning	Floyd, Ark.	Manahan	Taylor, Colo.
Bryan	Godwin, N. C.	Moon	Ten Eyck
Burgess	Goodwin, Ark.	Moore	Thomas
Burnett	Gregg	Murdoch	Thompson, Okla.
Byrnes, S. C.	Hardy	Murray	Thomson, Ill.
Candler, Miss.	Harrison	Neeley, Kans.	Vaughan
Cantrill	Helm	O'Hair	Vinson
Caraway	Henry	Park	Walker
Carlin	Holland	Post	Walters
Carter	Hughes, Ga.	Quin	Watkins
Clark, Fla.	Humphreys, Miss.	Ragsdale	Weaver
Claypool	Jacoway	Rayburn	Webb
Collier	Johnson, Ky.	Rouse	Whaley
Crisp	Johnson, S. C.	Saunders	Wingo
Crosser	Jones	Scott	Witherspoon
Cullop	Kelly, Pa.	Sims	Young, N. Dak.
Davenport	Kent	Sisson	
Dent	Key, Ohio		

NOT VOTING—149.

Aiken	Copley	Goldfogle	Lewis, Md.
Ainey	Dale	Gorman	Lewis, Pa.
Anthony	Davis	Graham, Pa.	Lindquist
Ashbrook	Deitrick	Griest	Lobeck
Avis	Difenderfer	Griffin	Loft
Bailey	Donohoe	Gudger	Logue
Barchfeld	Dooling	Hamill	Longergan
Bartholdt	Doremus	Harris	McClellan
Bathrick	Driscoll	Hart	McGuire, Okla.
Bell, Cal.	Drukker	Hay	Mahan
Borland	Dunn	Hayes	Maher
Bowdle	Eagan	Hedlin	Metz
Britten	Edmonds	Hill	Montague
Brodbeck	Elder	Hobson	Morgan, La.
Browne, Wis.	Fairchild	Howard	Morin
Bruckner	Faison	Hulings	Nolan, J. I.
Buchanan, Ill.	Farr	Keister	O'Brien
Bulkley	Ferris	Kelley, Mich.	Oglesby
Burke, Pa.	Fess	Kennedy, Conn.	Oldfield
Cantor	Francis	Kennedy, R. I.	O'Shaunessy
Carew	Gallivan	Kless, Pa.	Palmer
Carr	Garrett, Tenn.	Kindel	Parker, N. Y.
Cary	Garrett, Tex.	Kreider	Peters
Chandler, N. Y.	George	Lafferty	Peterson
Coady	Gerry	Langham	Porter
Connelly, Kans.	Gillmore	L'Engle	Price
Connolly, Iowa	Gittins	Leshner	Prouty
Conry	Glass	Levy	Reed

Reilly, Conn.	Slomp	Taylor, N. Y.	Williams
Riordan	Smith, Idaho	Temple	Wilson, Fla.
Roberts, Mass.	Smith, Saml. W.	Towner	Wilson, N. Y.
Roberts, Nev.	Sparkman	Townsend	Winslow
Rothermel	Stafford	Tribble	Woodruff
Rupley	Stanley	Tuttle	Woods
Sabath	Sumners	Vare	Young, Tex.
Scully	Switzer	Walsh	
Sherley	Talbott, Md.	Watson	
Shreve	Tavener	White	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. WINSLOW (for) with Mr. TRIBBLE (against).

Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut (for) with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee (against).

Mr. MAHER (for) with Mr. WILSON of Florida (against).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (for) with Mr. HOWARD (against).

Mr. SWITZER (for) with Mr. HEFLIN (against).

Mr. FESS (for) with Mr. OLDFIELD (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. WOODS.

Mr. SABATH with Mr. WOODRUFF.

Mr. AIKEN with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. ASHBROOK with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. DALE with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. FERRIS with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.

Mr. BAILEY with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. GEORGE with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. BORLAND with Mr. AINEY.

Mr. BRUCKNER with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. CANTOR with Mr. AVIS.

Mr. CAREW with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. COADY with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas with Mr. BELL of California.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Iowa with Mr. BRITTEN.

Mr. DONOHUE with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DOOLING with Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin.

Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. CARY.

Mr. EAGAN with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. FARR.

Mr. GORMAN with Mr. HAYES.

Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. HULINGS.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. HART with Mr. KEISTER.

Mr. HAY with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.

Mr. LESHNER with Mr. KLESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. LOBECK with Mr. LANGHAM.

Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana with Mr. LINDQUIST.

Mr. OGLESBY with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. J. I. NOLAN.

Mr. PALMER with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. PRICE with Mr. PARKER of New York.

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. PROUTY.

Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. SHREVE.

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH.

Mr. SUMNERS with Mr. RUPLEY.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. VARE.

Mr. GLASS with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas with Mr. SMITH of Idaho.

Mr. WATSON with Mr. TEMPLE.

Mr. WILLIAMS with Mr. TOWNER.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WATSON, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. FERRIS, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. GRIFFIN, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors. In accordance with the motion just agreed to, the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill (H. R. 21318), and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] will take the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Greenwich, Conn., post office: For commencement, \$50,000.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. On Saturday there was some discussion with reference to the item found in lines 3 and 4 of page 8, being an appropriation for the commencement of the building at Globe, Ariz., and in connection with that some reference was made to the appropriation for Greenwich, Conn., reading:

Greenwich, Conn., post office: For commencement, \$50,000.

Which is the item just read by the Clerk.

I do not think the matter was made clear by the explanation that was made by the chairman of the committee, Mr. FITZGERALD, the other day. I would like to ask the gentleman if he can inform us further in regard to the items that are in this bill for the commencement of public buildings where only \$1,000 is appropriated, there being 36 such items.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I requested the Supervising Architect to prepare a statement in reference to the matter, which I will read.

The statement referred to follows:

Appropriations for the public-building work are available immediately on the passage of the act. The estimates for appropriations for the public-building work contained in the pending sundry civil bill were based upon the period between March 4, 1915, by which date it was assumed the act would be approved, until June 30, 1916, by which date it was assumed the succeeding act would be approved. The estimates, therefore, cover a 16-month period.

Work on the plans and specifications for buildings in prior public-building acts will occupy the attention of the office of the Supervising Architect until about July 1, 1915. Approximately, on that date work will be started upon the plans and specifications for the extensions and new buildings in the 1913 act. The first new buildings to be taken up will be those authorized in the 1913 act upon sites authorized in prior acts. Buildings are taken up in accordance with the chronological order of the acquisition of the sites; therefore, a building authorized in the 1913 act upon a site authorized in the 1910 act will take precedence over a building authorized in the 1913 act on a site authorized in the same act.

The accompanying schedule gives the list of extensions in the 1913 act and of new buildings in the 1913 act authorized to be erected upon sites authorized in prior acts. It contains 149 projects, and will represent about two years' work from the 1st of the coming July. The program for the balance of the buildings authorized in the 1913 act has not as yet been made up. This is for two reasons: First and foremost, not all the sites authorized for these buildings have been acquired, so that the list could not be completed if it were to be commenced; and, second, the commencement of work on this section of the 1913 act is at least two years off, and there is no immediate necessity of making up the program. Therefore, if any projects are not found in the accompanying list it is because they are in the program which will follow, and which, as stated, has not as yet been made up.

Before the plans of any building may be prepared it is necessary to obtain a careful survey, giving lines, grades, depths of sewers, etc., and in many cases it is necessary to supplement this survey by either digging test pits or arranging for test borings in order to determine the character of the subsoil. These costs are incidental to the construction of the building and are chargeable to their limits. Therefore in order to commence work on the plans of a building it is necessary to have an appropriation which will cover the cost of the survey and test pits. If the preparation of the plans will not commence until toward the end of the period covered by the act, only sufficient money is necessary to pay for the cost of surveys, test pits, etc. If, however, the preparation of the plans commences toward the beginning of the period covered by the act, then there is required not only the money for the survey and test pits but a sufficient sum in addition to meet the costs of construction until the following bill is approved.

The items at the head of the 1913 projects, the plans for which will be started about July 1, 1915, are in the larger amounts, and, as stated, include sums which it is expected will be needed to pay to contractors on account of actual construction work in the period which will elapse until about June 30, 1916. The other amounts, in every case for a thousand dollars, are for projects for which the surveys will be required before June 30, 1916, and upon which work on the preliminary studies may be started, but for which there will be no expenses on account of construction until the 1917 act is approved. The accompanying list, arranged numerically with the amounts in each case, will show that for the projects at the beginning of the list the larger amounts are required, whereas for those at the end of the list only sufficient funds are estimated to start the preliminary work.

Formerly it was the custom to estimate for nothing less than \$15,000 to \$25,000. This resulted in appropriations largely in excess of current needs, and the practice now is to estimate for \$1,000 if nothing may be done on the project except the preliminary work; that is to say, obtaining surveys, test pits, etc. Even at that, \$1,000 is more than necessary, because this preliminary expense generally does not exceed \$300 or \$400.

The practice of asking for appropriations of from \$15,000 to \$25,000 left the Government in this situation: Heretofore there has been appropriated about \$20,000,000 in excess of what it has been possible for the Treasury Department to use, and of this \$20,000,000 heretofore appropriated and available only about \$8,000,000 can be expended in the period covered by this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I ask unanimous consent for an extension of five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the gentleman will be recognized for five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. For this reason the Treasury has initiated the practice of asking for the sum of \$1,000 instead of an

appropriation of \$15,000 or \$20,000 or \$25,000 for these buildings upon which only the preliminary work is to be done.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the statement made by the gentleman verifies the statement that I made when the matter was discussed on Saturday. This practice of appropriating \$1,000 for the commencement of buildings is an innovation. It never has been done before. The fact is that out of the first appropriation that is made for the construction of a public building the cost of the plans, the specifications, and the survey is paid from the appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not for the plans.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Well, the survey. My understanding, though, is that it does include the cost of the plans. The practice heretofore has been to appropriate not less than from \$15,000 to \$30,000 in each case for the commencement of buildings authorized where the sites have been acquired, when during the fiscal year there would perhaps be no part of it used except such part as would be expended in the survey and sinking the test pits; and these buildings for which \$1,000 is appropriated will be cared for in the next appropriation bill, which will appropriate the money in plenty of time to be used in paying the contractor in the next fiscal year; and I want to say to the gentleman, for the benefit of the House, that in these two cases, both authorized by the same act, the one at Globe, Ariz., to cost \$100,000 and the one at Greenwich to cost \$90,000, the reason that the appropriation at Greenwich is \$50,000 and the appropriation at Globe only \$1,000 is because the site at Greenwich was authorized in 1906, whereas the site at Globe, Ariz., was not authorized until 1908.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Nineteen hundred and ten.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Nineteen hundred and eight they told me. Therefore the building will be upon the market at Greenwich several months in advance of the building at Globe, and for that reason it is necessary to provide money to pay the contractor on account of the construction.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Greenwich, Conn., is No. 8 in numerical order and Globe, Ariz., is 98, so that there is considerable difference in the time when the plans will be reached.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. And yet the buildings were authorized by the same act.

Mr. FITZGERALD. By the same act; but the site was acquired so much earlier that the project got a number when the site was acquired.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. This condition that obtains with respect to these two buildings explains as to other similar cases. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The colloquy between the gentleman from South Dakota and the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee, has certainly explained some matters that I was at sea about on Saturday. The difference between authorization and ownership of sites is perfectly clear now. While we have made the break in the reading of the bill I desire to ask the chairman one or two questions. I see on page 63 of the hearings in Mr. Wetmore's testimony something about which I desire to interrogate the gentleman from New York. Mr. Wetmore is the executive officer of the Supervising Architect's Office. In speaking about the \$21,000,000 which seems to be on hand, having previously been appropriated, he says, near the bottom of the page:

It looks as though we ought not to have balances on our books so far in excess of our needs. The idea was to clean up those balances, so that we could start another year and estimate specifically on what we will need from time to time.

I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if there is any explanation different from that given by Mr. Wetmore, that we really do not need to have those large balances, and therefore that the appropriations, perhaps, could be cut down at this time?

Mr. FITZGERALD. He was discussing a different matter. The Treasury Department has requested that instead of making specific appropriations for specific buildings a provision be inserted making one fund out of all of the balances of appropriations heretofore made and not expended, and that then the Treasury Department have authority to expend that money upon the buildings enumerated within its discretion. Appropriations have been made far in excess of the amounts that could be expended for a number of reasons. First, more was asked than was really required. Secondly, after the appropriations were made difficulties of numerous kinds arose which made it impossible to proceed with the work. The result is that while very large sums have been appropriated a considerable portion of them has not been expended.

Mr. GOULDEN. Does the gentleman think that is good business policy to pursue on the part of Congress—to appropriate such large sums of money when not actually needed?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; but I do not know how anyone, outside of the Treasury Department, can tell how much money will actually be needed to meet the obligations upon contracts in existence or about to be entered into. The policy of Congress has been to assume that the Treasury Department will ask the amount of money actually required, and it has been appropriated in that way. If Congress were to attempt to take each one of these projects and make that minute examination that would be necessary to determine whether \$50,000 can actually be expended under a contract or only \$20,000, it would engage in a vast amount of work that would not result very profitably. The department estimates to the best of its ability how rapidly buildings will proceed. Nobody can state with any definiteness about it.

Mr. GOULDEN. That is satisfactory. I will ask another question. Assuming that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds brought in a bill for a building during the Sixty-fourth Congress, in how many years would a building authorized in that measure likely be reached in the present condition of the Supervising Architect's Office?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know. They expect to commence on the 1st of July with the plans for the buildings authorized in the act of 1913.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Wetmore, in the hearings, gives certain information on this subject. I read the following from the hearings:

Mr. SHERLEY. How far are you behind?

Mr. WETMORE. We are not behind at all in the sense of being behind with our program. We have ahead of us about six years' work, I should say—between five and six years' work—but we are not behind, because we are turning out 70 or 80 buildings annually, which is the normal output of our present force. When we are working along at this rate and Congress authorizes 300 or more buildings at one time, that does not put us behind in the sense that we are not keeping up with our work.

Does it not follow that an authorization made for a public building this or next year would not in all probability be reached by the office inside of five or six years? I have in mind a site in the Borough of the Bronx, city of New York, to which the Government took title July 7, 1914, and which stands No. 6 on the list of sites to be taken up by the Supervising Architect's Office when the Committee on Buildings and Grounds authorize the erection of the building. This will likely occur in the next Congress. I would like to ask the chairman this question: Have they a sufficient force in the Supervising Architect's Office to enable them to do the work and keep up with the same? It seems to me to be poor business to be behind five or six years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman I will state that they have a sufficient force to turn out 70 or 80 buildings a year. To increase the force would be to increase the expenditures of public buildings annually. Congress has determined that the rate of expenditures shall be as it has been, and it averages somewhere between fifteen and twenty million dollars a year.

Mr. GOULDEN. I think that is sufficient; but I also claim that we ought not to appropriate more than can be judiciously and economically expended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Humboldt, Tenn., post office: For commencement, \$1,000.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 10, page 9, insert:

"Statesboro, Ga.: For commencement, \$1,000."

Mr. EDWARDS. I would like to ask the chairman if Statesboro, Ga., has been included in the estimates submitted by the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department?

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is no estimate submitted for Statesboro.

Mr. EDWARDS. I would like to ask the chairman why the estimates for these various buildings that have been authorized have not been made?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Statesboro was not estimated for because it is not a building which in its order will be reached prior to July 1, 1916. Statesboro is No. 121.

Mr. EDWARDS. On the list?

Mr. FITZGERALD. On the list.

Mr. EDWARDS. I would like to ask the gentleman if they take them up alphabetically or in the order of importance, or how?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; they are given a number as soon as the site is acquired.

Mr. EDWARDS. Well, this site has been acquired and the building has been authorized. It is an important point and great necessity exists for its commencement and for its early completion.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. At what time was the site acquired; what is the date?

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not now recall, but it was some four or five years ago.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The site was authorized by the act of March, 1910, and the building was authorized in the act of 1913.

Mr. CARTER. When was the site acquired?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know that.

Mr. CARTER. That is the time the proposition takes its regular order.

Mr. EDWARDS. What I am trying to get at is to find out how the Treasury Department places these various sites and gives them order on the list.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will state, Mr. Chairman, that the place given these towns dates from the time the title to the site vests in the Government. The Supervising Architect does not give any town a place until the title has been acquired and is vested in the Government. Then it is given to it.

Mr. Sisson. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. Certainly.

Mr. Sisson. If a building and site are in separate appropriation bills, one bill containing a site, and a succeeding Congress appropriates for the building, then, acquisition of the site will not give such a building a number until the appropriation for the building is made; it does not give that building a preference over an appropriation which authorizes both the site and building? For example, take in 1910 an authorization for a site and building, both; when the lot is purchased it gets a number?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It does not.

Mr. Sisson. The trouble with the gentleman from Georgia is that he had an appropriation for a site only, and that does not give a preference over a building where both the site and building was authorized in the same bill.

Mr. EDWARDS. But the building has since been authorized.

Mr. Sisson. But it does not take precedence over a building where both the site and building is authorized in 1910 and will precede the number of that of the gentleman from Georgia, because they can not give a building any number until the money is authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Jellico, Tenn., post office: For completion, \$30,000.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee for this information: As I understand the order in which these specifications and plans are prepared and buildings started is determined solely by the date of the acquisition of the title to the lot by the Government, so that a building authorized in the last act, 1913, is, say, 118 on the list, if an item for \$1,000 was given in this bill for commencement, would that give that town any preference or would it still have to wait its regular order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understand it would still wait its regular order.

Mr. WINGO. So no practical benefit would be derived from an appropriation at this time?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Except under these conditions: There are items, for instance, the department asked for appropriations for three buildings upon the express reason it is proposed that they would make a donation and therefore they would take these buildings up out of their turn.

Mr. WINGO. For what reason did they propose that?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Because it is proposed to have it donated, and the committee declined to make recommendation for buildings out of their turn because the policy has been established to take them up in their order, and that is the understanding of the Members of the House, and it is only fair; and the committee believe if the House desired to take out of their turn these buildings for such a reason it was in its power to do so, but the committee preferred not to recommend an appro-

priation for any building except in its order, unless it is a case such as I referred to the other day—

Mr. WINGO. In other words, an emergency.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Where a building had been destroyed by fire or some other catastrophe. There have been times when a project for some community has been advanced out of its turn, but that is a well-understood rule.

Mr. WINGO. As I understand, the projects carried in the bill of March, 1913, will not be reached in the Supervising Architect's Office until July of this year?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. And then the Supervising Architect's Office will take them up in the order on the list they are acquired?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. And it is estimated they will continue to provide for about 80 buildings a year, which has been about the customary amount turned out by this office in the past, and that nothing can be done now in the way of making an appropriation, which would disturb the regular order, which would hasten the construction of the building?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It would not.

Mr. WINGO. It would have no practical effect?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It would not. It would unnecessarily appropriate money that could not possibly be used.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CALLAWAY. What is the rule for purchasing sites? Does that come in regular order, like the provision for buildings?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Previous to the enactment of the bill for 1913 the custom had been to invite bids for sites and to send out some employee of the Treasury Department to examine the proposed sites. About two years ago, I think it was, we appropriated money for site agents, so that a special force of men was sent out to investigate, and I think practically all the sites have been reported upon.

Mr. CALLAWAY. But they have not been purchased.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am unable to state whether they have purchased them all or not. They appropriated all the money that the department asked for.

Mr. CALLAWAY. You say when provisions are made for public buildings they then take their place and are appropriated for in order. Suppose some division has been changed and congested mail conditions exist at some place different than what have heretofore existed, and the facilities are wholly incapable of accommodating the mails, would they not then make special provision to appropriate to enlarge the equipment there to meet the actual needs?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In the case of a new building?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes; or the improvement of an old building.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Extensions are put at the head of the new list. For instance, in the act of 1913 both new buildings and extensions were authorized. They put the extensions at the head of the list.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Did they take their regular order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They took their regular order.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Irrespective of the necessity?

Mr. FITZGERALD. There have been some cases where the department stated that owing to the very extraordinary conditions an extension should be taken up out of its turn, and that has been done.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. In order that the record may be clear on this matter, will the gentleman tell us where the appropriation is made, out of which the plans and specifications are paid for, for public buildings? I ask this information because the Supervising Architect told me in a conversation this morning that the plans and specifications were paid for out of the first appropriation made for the building, and I understand if he did so state he is in error, and I wish the gentleman would explain it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. A permanent staff is carried in the legislative bill, and then on page 25 of this bill, under general expenses, will be found provision for a force of architectural designers.

For one architectural designer, at \$6,000 per annum; for foremen draftsmen, architectural draftsmen, and apprentice draftsmen, at rates of pay from \$480 to \$2,500 per annum; for structural engineers and draftsmen, at rates of pay from \$840 to \$2,200 per annum; for mechanical, sanitary, electrical, heating and ventilating, and illuminating engineers and draftsmen, at rates of pay from \$1,200 to \$2,400 per annum; for computers and estimators, at rates of pay from \$1,600 to \$2,500

per annum, the expenditures under all the foregoing classes for which a minimum and maximum rate of compensation is stated, not to exceed \$168,450—

And so forth.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Then no part of the appropriation specifically made for a building is used to pay for plans and specifications?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The act of 1908 prohibits the payment of cost of plans from the appropriation for the building.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to ask the gentleman one or two questions. I was very much interested in what he said in reference to advancing buildings out of order in the case of certain donations. I think in the case we had up Saturday the committee ascertained that there will be no real advantage to the Government from the donation; but in a case where a donation is really substantial, does not the gentleman think it would be a good policy for Congress and the Government to encourage such donations, where a substantial saving would be made to the Government by permitting an advancement out of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It would depend on what the gentleman would mean by a "substantial donation."

Mr. LENROOT. I mean, as a good business proposition, where it would actually save money to the Government by doing that thing.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There have been instances where some one has donated a site and Congress has expedited the construction of the building upon it.

Mr. LENROOT. I mean where it would be actually substantial.

Mr. FITZGERALD. From my point of view, I do not know that it would be wise to expedite buildings where it is a notorious fact that after a building is constructed a permanent charge is imposed upon the Treasury far in excess of what the Government can secure ample and satisfactory accommodations for in the community without it.

Mr. LENROOT. I refer only to cases where the sites and buildings themselves have been authorized.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But those cases to which I refer are cases where it is proposed to donate plans. If plans are presented to the Government for their acceptance, the theory is that the Government has been saved a certain expense in the preparation of the plans; but as a matter of fact, however, it is necessary to examine those plans very critically to determine whether they are plans of a building that will be suitable for the needs of the Government in that community; and the committee were of the opinion that as a practical matter the Supervising Architect's office in effect was doing the same work that it would be doing if the plans were prepared in the office; and if the building in those cases were to be advanced out of order, it would be a matter for the House itself to determine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lawton, Okla., post office and courthouse: For completion, \$152,300.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, after line 5, page 11, the following:

"Willow, Cal., post office: For completion of building under present limit, \$75,000."

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, this building was recommended by the Treasury Department. The situation was as follows: At the time the building bill was introduced, under the terms and conditions that the committee imposed for buildings, this town seemed to the committee to justify an expenditure for buildings of \$100,000, owing to the fact that, in addition to the post-office receipts, there were in that town the centers of the Forestry Service and the Bureau of Animal Industry. Instead of asking for the full amount I asked for \$75,000, and that was inserted in the building bill. Subsequent to that I asked the people of that city to contribute a site. They offered several sites. A Government inspector went up and looked the sites over and determined on an entirely different one. Thereafter these people, at my request, in order to give the Government the best site and to expedite construction, dug down into their pockets and put up \$9,000 for the site suggested by the inspector. Subsequently I called on the department to ascertain whether or not it would be in order that plans should be furnished by outside architects subject to revision and ratification by the department. I was informed that this could be done, and that this would expedite building. Then I told the people that provision would have to be made for the plans if they de-

sired to have the building expedited. Arrangements were made for the architects' fees, and then after that a Government inspector was ordered there to examine the site so as to determine foundations, and I suppose it may now be contended that the building is already under way.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENT. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. Does the gentleman say that this site was given to the Government?

Mr. KENT. Not only donated, but was the site that the Government inspector selected as the best site in town. The people were requested to pay for a site and give it to the Government, which they did.

Mr. SISSON. When was the site acquired?

Mr. KENT. Last summer; but, owing to technical trouble concerning conveyance of title, acceptance of the deed was delayed until October 28, 1914.

Mr. SISSON. The lot was accepted by the Government and was paid for by the citizens of the town?

Mr. KENT. Yes; the Government selected the lot, and the people paid for it, and the lot is now in the possession of the Government and has been since October 28, 1914.

Mr. SISSON. Have plans and specifications been prepared for the building?

Mr. KENT. They have been arranged for, and as soon as the inspector reports on foundations the department has absolute assurance that the plans will be carried through to completion, subject to the Government's approval and correction. The Government has a written guaranty, which seems to be satisfactory to the Government, that plans will be immediately furnished.

Mr. SISSON. Are the plans offered to the Government by the citizens out there?

Mr. KENT. They are offered to the Government, to be paid for in part by the citizens and in part by myself. They are donated to the Government.

Mr. SISSON. And the people have given the Government the lot?

Mr. KENT. They have.

Mr. SISSON. The citizens and the gentleman from California are willing to pay for the plans and specifications?

Mr. KENT. That is correct.

Mr. SISSON. The gentleman does not insist that the Government is saving anything if they expend the whole \$75,000 on the building?

Mr. KENT. My contention would be that the people and the Government get a building that has so much more money in it than if they had taken the commission of the architects out of it.

Mr. SISSON. That does not save the Treasury anything.

Mr. KENT. No.

Mr. SISSON. Would the gentleman be willing that the cost of the plans and specifications be deducted from the \$75,000?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SISSON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from California be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. In no case is the cost of the plans taken out of the appropriations for buildings. That is taken out of another fund, so it will be a saving to the Government.

Mr. SISSON. It is immaterial to the Government at which end it saves the money.

Mr. LENROOT. This would be a saving to the Government.

Mr. SISSON. What I am endeavoring to do is to put the gentleman's item in a place where the Government saves the architect's fees.

Mr. LENROOT. It will.

Mr. SISSON. If the gentleman is willing to take from the \$75,000 the expense of the architect's fees, although a member of the committee, I would support his proposition.

Mr. LENROOT. That would be saving it twice, if deducted from this appropriation.

Mr. SISSON. It would not.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; because the cost of the plans and specifications in any case comes out of an appropriation that is made in the legislative bill.

Mr. BURNETT. And in that way the Government saves the expense of getting up plans.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENT. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. I understood the chairman of the Appropriation Committee to make a statement on Saturday that

there were three of these projects not included in this appropriation bill that were recommended to be included by the Secretary of the Treasury. Is this one of them?

Mr. KENT. This is one of the three. It stands on the same footing as the project of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GOODWIN]. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to state here and now that if it is the opinion of the House that this building should be cut in cost to the amount of the architect's fees for the plans, I am willing to submit and will submit an amendment that the total be reduced 5 per cent of \$75,000, leaving \$71,250 instead of \$75,000. The Government is under a liability to build this building at some time, and the people having saved the Government the expense of the lot, it seems to me that this is a good time to adopt it. The building is needed. The Post Office Department is cramped, and the Department of Animal Industry has inadequate quarters, and the Forestry Service has an important adjunct there. The department strongly recommends that this building be put into the bill, and I hope the amendment will be adopted. Mr. Chairman, I move to modify my amendment by reducing the amount of \$75,000 5 per cent, or \$3,500, leaving \$71,250.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modify the amendment so that it will read: "For completion of the building under the present limit of cost, \$71,250."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, of course the modified amendment of the gentleman from California does not change the situation. The limit of such a building is \$75,000, and an appropriation of \$71,250 would still leave it possible for the other \$3,750 to be appropriated at any time it was deemed proper.

I am opposed to the adoption of the amendment at all. Willow, Cal., in 1910 had a population of 1,139 people. The postal receipts in 1913 were \$13,113, the money-order receipts \$58,597, and the postal saving receipts \$1,224. At the present time the Post Office Department and the Forestry Service rent buildings at Willow, Cal., necessary for the needs of the two services, and the Post Office Department pays \$600 a year and the Forestry Service pays \$600 a year.

Mr. KENT. There is also the Bureau of Animal Industry.

Mr. FITZGERALD. So that the total expenditure to accommodate these two branches of the Government service amounts to \$1,200 a year. A very careful estimate by the Treasury Department discloses that the annual cost to the Government of a \$50,000 building is 10 per cent of the amount invested in it, and if the same be true of a \$75,000 building, allowing for interest on the money invested and other carrying charges, then for the benefit that is derived by the Government from accepting a site for this public building we will expend \$75,000 to provide facilities when these two services mentioned cost \$1,200 a year, and even if you allow \$600 a year more for the Bureau of Animal Industry, the total cost would be only \$1,800 a year, and we would assume a burden of \$7,000 annually to give to a community of 1,139 people a \$75,000 building. Mr. Chairman, I think that whatever necessity or excuse there may be for putting up a \$75,000 building in a town of 1,139 people, there can not be that very great urgency that would justify the appropriation at this time, when the condition of the Treasury is such that it would be advisable to discontinue a great many very urgent projects.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I want to ask the gentleman if the amount expended at this place now for rent includes fuel and light?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; I understand it includes everything.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. The amount includes light and janitor service and heat. I now yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] is ignorant of the fact that this town is situated in a part of California that is growing most rapidly. It is in the most fertile part of the Sacramento Valley. The parcel-post business has increased greatly. There are a great number of rural routes that center there, and the call for space is increasing all of the time. The gentleman is taking the figures of some time ago in respect to the population, and the place has grown a great deal since that time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, they are the latest figures available. I wish to say to the House that if the policy be adopted of putting \$75,000 buildings in every community of

1,000 or 2,000 people in the United States who will donate a site, the Treasury of the United States will be bankrupt so quickly that Members will not know what has happened to it at night. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, the argument that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] has made to-day is the same argument he and others made who were opposed to the construction of public buildings in small towns when this item was authorized. That was all thrashed out two years ago, and the House by an overwhelming vote passed the bill making this authorization, among others. If his argument is correct, then the Committee on Appropriations for the same cause could thwart the will of Congress by turning down these cases all along the line. I know that my friend the chairman of the committee obeys the law and is not for cutting out the propositions provided for in this bill, but I merely say that his argument against this proposition would apply with equal force to many other items in the bill. Why single out this one?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. If you want your expenses cut, why not do it on battleships? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the committee has not recommended this item, as I have already stated, because this was a proposition to advance this building out of its order—

Mr. BURNETT. I understand that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. At the expense of the buildings of other Members authorized prior to this and which are entitled to consideration before this building.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, in reply to that, the reason why that is done is because of the fact that the Treasury Department always says they are behind with plans and specifications, and that that postpones our buildings for four years. I do not care so much about the population. This town came within the rule of the Public Buildings Committee. We had a scale, and where the postal receipts were from ten to twelve thousand dollars a year the building was to cost \$50,000, and where they were from twelve to fifteen thousand dollars a year sixty thousand; and in case there were other Government offices to be housed there, like the Bureau of Animal Industry and the Forestry Service, an allowance was made for that, and hence an appropriation of \$75,000 in this case. As I say, the reason these matters have been deferred is because of the fact that they can not reach them with their plans and specifications.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Does not the gentleman think it would be a good idea to increase the force in the Supervising Architect's Office and proceed to expedite these matters?

Mr. BURNETT. I do; and everyone knows that we have been trying to standardize, and we now have bills before the committee that will possibly be reported at this session by which we hope to work some expedition in these matters.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. The gentleman from Georgia asks if the gentleman from Alabama would not be in favor of increasing the force in the Supervising Architect's Office. Is it not a fact that we tried to get that done either last year or the year before and the Committee on Appropriations defeated the proposition?

Mr. BURNETT. That is my recollection. The people of this town of Willow by their own voluntary contributions have met that condition which the department says is the reason why we can not get them more speedily, and are we now to punish a town that is willing to meet that very condition, when they want to have this matter expedited, and this voluntary donation was made in order that we may do that which the architect's office says would be done if they had the force to meet it.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. KENT. The gentleman from Alabama has made it plain, but I want to make it still more plain that this does not in any way impede the right of way of any other Member, because the stoppage is in the plan department of the Supervising Architect's Office.

Mr. BURNETT. That is exactly what I desired to say, but the gentleman has stated it more clearly than I have done.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. DONOVAN. Do I understand the gentleman from Alabama that they fixed the amount at \$50,000 where the population was 5,000?

Mr. BURNETT. Five thousand people; no, sir. I said wherever the receipts of the post office were \$10,000 or in excess; the receipts of the office, not the population. Now, that is all I

think I desire to say. The people have met the conditions that congested the construction of buildings, and it does not postpone any building that has been authorized by this Congress.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman from Alabama is quite fair with the Committee on Appropriations—

Mr. BURNETT. I do not desire to criticize the committee in the least.

Mr. SISSON (continuing). Because the gentleman from Alabama knows that with the exception of three cases where the Treasury thought that buildings ought to be advanced out of their order the Committee on Appropriations gave every dollar the Treasury Department asked for. In addition to that, the Committee on Appropriations would not undertake to set aside the expressed will of Congress in the legislation which it passes, because it is our duty, where it can be done, to carry out the expressed wish and will of the Congress, and while the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has been opposed to the general policy, I think it is fair to him to state that there has been no more zealous advocate of absolutely, honestly, and fairly carrying out the will of Congress than he has been in making up this bill, and I am not divulging anything that happened in the Committee on Appropriations, but I want to say to those gentlemen when the effort was made not to make the appropriations there was no more valiant champion of appropriating for these buildings than the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BURNETT. May I interrupt the gentleman a moment? If anything I said would indicate that, I desire to correct it right now, because what I meant to say was the same argument that was applied to this would apply to other cases authorized, and not that the gentleman or his committee intended such a thing as that.

Mr. SISSON. I did not want that impression left, because we all know the gentleman from New York, the chairman of this committee, has been generally opposed to the appropriation of money for public buildings in small towns where the rent is \$50 or \$60 a month, to appropriate \$50,000 or \$75,000 for a building—

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. I want to ask the gentleman from Mississippi if he is not of the opinion that the Office of the Supervising Architect ought to be supplied with sufficient architects to go ahead and do the business of the country?

Mr. SISSON. I am glad the gentleman from Georgia asked that question, because I have consistently advocated the standardization of these buildings so that one set of plans would not only make a \$25,000 or a \$50,000, but a \$75,000 building. It looks to me like you might standardize that like the standardization of commercial buildings. You might standardize the steel, standardize the glass, standardize the sash and doors and blinds and all of such things, and by doing that and making the plans and blue prints for one would serve for a dozen buildings; but the Supervising Architect's Office is unwilling to do that.

Mr. EDWARDS. I would like to ask the gentleman—I have not read the sundry civil bill through—whether or not the bill carries an appropriation to make any increases in the Supervising Architect's Office, or whether or not there is any provision made in this bill—

Mr. SISSON. That would be carried in the legislative bill.

Mr. EDWARDS (continuing). To expedite the congestion or relieve the congestion of that office?

Mr. SISSON. That is carried in the legislative bill and not in this bill.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SISSON. I do.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I want to ask the gentleman why a bill passed in 1910 providing for post office and building, carrying an appropriation of \$55,000, for Washington, Ga., has not been provided for in this bill? That is nearly five years ago.

Mr. SISSON. I will state to the gentleman I do not know whether it is provided for or not. I must decline to yield further, but in answer to the gentleman from Georgia I will say that the authorizations for these buildings have been made with the distinct understanding that they will not lap in a preceding appropriation and thereby double the amount of money taken out of the Treasury, and it has been stated on the floor of the House by members of the committee that it will take two or three and sometimes four years to complete a building, and the money would not have to be taken out until that time. I want to state, without fear of successful contradiction, that the delay is not because we do not appropriate sufficient money in the architect's office to carry out the will of Congress, but it is

because the Supervising Architect's Office declines to adopt commercial plans and modern ideas in business. I do not think Congress is to blame for it. I think the fault is in the Supervising Architect's Office, and I want to say right here that you can have prepared plans and specifications in the commercial world and have supervision for 5 per cent, which is the universal architects' rule; and yet the testimony in this case shows that if the overhead charge is charged against the building in the Supervising Architect's Office it is a little over 6 per cent, so we are paying more money for the Supervising Architect's Office—6 per cent on the cost of the building—than the commercial architects charge to make the plans and specifications, which is 5 per cent.

Mr. FALCONER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. Sisson. I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FALCONER. The question discussed by the gentleman has been brought to my notice in connection with a public building in my own city, the appropriation for which was made in 1908. Now, I understood the gentleman to say that the Supervising Architect's Office takes the position against the standardization of public buildings. Is the gentleman correct in that statement?

Mr. Sisson. I believe I am correct, because I have never been able to find one of them who believes you could standardize public buildings. They will tell you that the lots are peculiar in shape; that the foundations are of a peculiar soil, and such other objections. We have been since I have been a Member of Congress endeavoring to get the Supervising Architect's Office to standardize these buildings. Now wait a moment; do not ask me too many questions at once. The gentleman from Florida and the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General are a committee now authorized by law to look into the whole subject, and I do not believe I am divulging anything that ought not to be divulged.

It is the opinion of at least one member of this committee that if the buildings of the United States were put up properly and in a businesslike way we could build for \$25,000 or \$30,000 or \$35,000, at the outside, buildings which are now costing the Government \$50,000 apiece. I do not know whether these buildings can be standardized or not, but common sense teaches me that they could be standardized. Here is a lot of a certain size, which must be purchased. The building costs \$50,000. In the South, where the climate is all about the same and where the materials and soil are all about the same for the buildings that we authorize, it is a violation of all reason to say that they could not be standardized, and if that were done, there would be no trouble about having the plans for these buildings prepared and having the buildings put up in time.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. Sisson. I do.

Mr. LANGLEY. I agree with the general statement made by the gentleman about the necessity for standardization, but, as I understood him, he made the statement that no two buildings in the country are just alike; in other words, that the Supervising Architect is opposed to erecting any two just alike.

Mr. Sisson. That is perhaps hyperbole. I would not undertake to say that there were no two alike.

Mr. LANGLEY. I understood the gentleman to make that statement. That is not fair to the Supervising Architect's Office.

Mr. Sisson. I do say this: That they do not want them just alike.

Mr. LANGLEY. I know, on the contrary, that they are now attempting to standardize them.

Mr. Sisson. To whom did you talk?

Mr. LANGLEY. To the Supervising Architect himself. And I think the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Austin], who is a member of that commission, will verify what I am saying.

Mr. Sisson. Then, why do they not standardize them as Congress wants them to do, without all the pressure being brought to bear? I have been down to the Supervising Architect's Office, not once but several times, and had several interviews, in which I insisted that they standardize these plans.

Mr. Austin. Mr. Chairman, every time we discuss this subject in the House of Representatives we are furnished with a great deal of misinformation with reference to the Supervising Architect's Office. In my capacity as a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds I have had ample opportunity to discuss this matter and investigate, both with the Supervising Architect and his subordinates, and then as a member of the joint commission created by the last public building bill, to which this subject of standardization was referred, we had any number of meetings in the Treasury Department, and,

as a result, reported our findings to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which designated a subcommittee to prepare legislation along the lines of the report of that commission.

It is true that a member of that commission, Postmaster General Burleson, did state in the minority report that many of these buildings could be erected for \$25,000. General Burleson wants a cheaper class of buildings for the small post offices of the country. Where we are now expending \$50,000, he wants to cut that amount in two and give a cheaper building, with a cheaper class of material, not a fireproof building.

In the last 25 or 30 years I have known perhaps half a dozen of the Supervising Architects of the Treasury Department. I can not name a more honorable, conscientious, or efficient Supervising Architect than the gentleman—Mr. Oscar Wenderoth—who now fills that position. It is a mistake and an error on the part of Members to make the assertion constantly that the Supervising Architect's Office is opposed to the standardization of public buildings. They not only favor it, but in every instance where it has been possible and practicable to do it they standardized the public buildings.

Mr. LANGLEY. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. Austin. I know that of my own experience, because there is now a public building in the town of Morristown, in my district, nearing completion, and they are beginning work on a public building at Jellico, and the two buildings are a duplication as far as they can be duplicated. As a result of duplication, carried on by the department, the present Supervising Architect has been enabled to increase the number of buildings and increase the number of plans.

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. Austin. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Does the gentleman know of any case where two buildings have been built alike?

Mr. Austin. I have just made the statement that the department is building two in my district which are alike, as far as they can be alike, on separate pieces of land in different towns.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mighty few public buildings come down my way, but the ones I have observed are all different.

Mr. Austin. One at Morristown, Tenn., and the other at Jellico, Tenn., are practically identical.

Mr. LANGLEY. They are as nearly alike as commercial houses could be standardized.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Austin. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I have no brief to defend the Supervising Architect, but I had occasion to investigate this very subject last week, and the Supervising Architect handed me a printed statement, in which he claims that there are some 20 or 25 buildings, the plans for all of which are drawn and all of which have the same identical plans, and he claims to be endeavoring to adopt a uniform plan. I hope he will succeed, because I hold the same views that my friend from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] does.

Mr. Austin. Some time ago they adopted that system and are following it out. Any statement the Supervising Architect made to the gentleman from South Carolina or any other Member of this House can be depended upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. Austin. I ask for an extension of three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks that his time be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. Austin. The last Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. MacVeagh, in order to reduce expenses and make a showing for economy, recommended a reduction in the working force of the Supervising Architect's Office, and the Committee on Appropriations reduced that force, and as a result the number of plans turned out per annum was reduced from 112 to about 75 or 80. The remedy desired in the hastening of plans and the construction of public buildings lies entirely with the membership of this House. Whenever this House votes to override the Committee on Appropriations and increases the force of the Supervising Architect, then the work of that office will be brought up to date.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, it is also necessary for the Secretary of the Treasury in submitting his estimates to the Committee on Appropriations to ask for a sufficient amount of money for public buildings to care for any increased number of plans the Supervising Architect's Office may turn out. Secretary MacVeagh was opposed to spending exceeding \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000 for the construction of new propositions, and the same policy is being followed out by the present Secretary. It is not right or just in the membership of this House to com-

plain about the failure of the Committee on Appropriations to embrace certain new propositions in this bill. The responsibility and blame rests with the Members, and when the majority vote to increase the Supervising Architect's Office force the work will be brought up to date.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, the discussion on this amendment has gone far afield, and I would like to bring it back to a consideration of the pending amendment. The argument that the chairman of the committee makes as to why this amendment should not be adopted has no bearing, I submit, on this question at all. It is an argument properly to be directed to the public-building bill, but not otherwise, and if it should apply to this item, it would apply with equal force, as the gentleman from Alabama has said, to a great many other items in this bill.

The situation is that this building has been authorized to the extent of \$75,000, and the only question for this committee to consider is whether under the peculiar circumstances of this case this building shall be advanced out of its order. Let me say that if this amendment is adopted it will not sidetrack any other proposition in the pending bill; it will not sidetrack any other in the future; but, on the contrary, if the amendment is not adopted in this bill now, it will be adopted in a bill next year, and some other building will be delayed one year longer. If it is not put in the bill, no other building will take its place. All the buildings, including this one, can be and will be taken care of by the department now, and if it is not taken care of this year it will have to be taken care of next year, and thus delay another building.

Why should this be taken out of order? I submit that, as a matter of policy, when the citizens of a community are willing to go down into their pockets and dig up \$9,000 for the purchase of a site, give that site to the Government, and, in addition, when they are willing to go down into their pockets and pay for the plans of the building and give them to the Government, I say it is good policy to encourage that saving to the Government by advancing the building out of order.

Mr. Chairman, there are something like 150 separate appropriations in this measure. The appropriation for each site ranges from \$5,000 to \$25,000, and in some cases higher.

Now, if any of these communities where sites are appropriated for in this bill are willing to pay for these sites themselves, pay \$5,000 for them, and say, "We will pay for that if we can get the building sooner," is it not good business judgment for this Congress and this Government to save that money and give it to them, and especially if, as in this amendment, it will not displace any other building? If you do not put this in the bill now, some Member of this House—none of us know who it may be—next year will find his building omitted in the bill, when, if this amendment is adopted now, another may be included next year.

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Public Buildings Committee, I desire to make this statement in reference to this item. It has always been my desire to assist any Member of this House in forwarding any legislation he has when the circumstances met my view as to public policy. But I think the statements that have been made on this particular measure are far from the facts that should come before this House.

Now, the facts are these: The gentleman from California [Mr. KENT] asked for an appropriation for \$71,000 in this bill because his constituents have donated \$9,000 for the site. I contend that that is not a good policy for the House to adopt. Because the gentleman himself, out of the kindness of his heart and his great wealth, possibly, permit him and his constituents to come in and put up \$9,000 and then demand that Congress should immediately appropriate \$71,000 to follow that up, it puts the other membership of the House and their constituents who happen not to be so wealthy at a great disadvantage, and it gives the wealthy constituency a great advantage over the constituencies who are not able to dig down into their pockets and advance the bill out of the regular order. And in addition there is no money saved by the Government. Even if they have appropriated \$9,000, it is no saving, because in the regular order—the same order that every other Member on this floor will have to follow—it will be three or four years before this building is reached, and the interest on \$75,000 in three or four

years will more than offset the money saved by the gift of the site.

More than that, the amendment is at fault, because when the buildings are authorized we have authorized \$75,000 for this site, but in the regular order of appropriation next year possibly the Committee on Appropriations will appropriate \$25,000 for the commencement of this building. It will take three or four years to build it; and in two years from that they will appropriate \$25,000 or \$30,000 more for continuation, and then four or five years, in its regular order, they will appropriate the balance for the building. And yet this amendment takes \$71,000 in a lump sum now and appropriates it for the project just begun, when the money, or the most of it, will lie idle for three or four years. As a matter of policy I contend that it is wrong, and as a matter of business it ought to be strung out like every other appropriation—over a series of years that it will take to complete the building. I claim that it is a bad piece of legislation and is no saving to the Government.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTRILL. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. Is not the reason for these delays because of the delay in getting the plans and specifications, and is not that the equity of the gentleman's case—that they have met the conditions that bring about the delay by reason of making the plans and specifications themselves?

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to warn my colleague on the committee of the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that if we are going to adopt this policy and permit people to come in here with a few thousand dollars subscribed for sites and to demand of Congress that these appropriations be all put through in a lump sum, we will be confronted with a very serious situation; and I submit to my colleague on the committee that we are adopting a dangerous precedent, and, as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has said, it will mean bankruptcy to the Government if we undertake to build all of these buildings at one time.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the House approving this amendment if it so desires, but I am anxious that the Committee of the Whole shall understand the situation and shall understand the views of the Committee on Appropriations with regard to it. When these public-building estimates were made, we were informed that there were three items taken out of their order—Arkadelphia and Fordyce, Ark., and Willow, Cal. Gentlemen will notice the activity during the last few moments on the part of a number of gentlemen from Arkansas who also have an amendment to offer. The Committee on Appropriations did not believe it was justified in allowing any public building to be taken out of its regular order.

If the committee wants to take any building, or any two or any three buildings, out of order, that is the business of the committee, but the Committee on Appropriations did not want to take that responsibility. Doing that does unquestionably delay every other building. We particularly did not feel justified in taking a building out of its order simply because some community was able to make a donation to the Government. There are other communities that need public buildings quite as badly as does Willow, Cal., that are not so fortunate in having funds wherewith to buy sites. In the Arkansas cases there are, I think, no sites donated. The other argument, and the only argument that applies to all the cases, is that plans were drawn without expense to the Treasury. That is more or less of a fiction when it comes to a question of saving. My opinion is that the Treasury does not save much in the long run by the preparation of plans for the department, because my opinion is that by the time the Treasury has gone over the plans and corrected them and modified them, as will be necessary, the expense will be about as great as it would be had the plans been prepared in the first instance by the department. That is the situation. If this committee wants to take these particular items out of order where there are people able to contribute to the Federal Government, well and good. I understand there is a law prohibiting that being done, and if you want to ignore that law because some community is fortunate enough to be able to do these things, and thereby advance that community beyond all other communities, of course it is within the right of the committee to do it.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. Do I understand the gentleman to say that there is a law prohibiting this?

Mr. MONDELL. There is a law prohibiting the contribution of services to the Federal Government.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does the gentleman think that that applies to the giving of a site to the Government for a public building?

Mr. MONDELL. It certainly applies to the giving of services, and the drawing of plans is the giving of services. You can make a new law here, of course. There is no question about that; but I do not believe communities should have their public buildings deferred because some one community sees fit to prepare plans.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] said that if we voted this down, then we would see our own buildings deferred some time in the future. It is not a question of deferring. This is a question of taking a building up out of its order and advancing it, and putting it ahead of a hundred other buildings that in the ordinary course of events would have construction begun upon them before the construction of this building. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRELL] has called attention to the fact that in any event it is not good business to appropriate \$75,000 for this building at this time, for the money could not all be used during the fiscal year in any event.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. The department has estimated for this building, has it not?

Mr. MONDELL. The department assumed to take this building out of its order, for certain reasons. If you want to encourage the department in creating excuses for taking buildings out of their order, then agree to this proposition. If you want the Committee on Appropriations to formulate excuses for taking buildings out of their order and bringing buildings in here out of their order, very good; but the committee believes that it is its duty to provide for these buildings in an orderly manner.

Mr. LENROOT. If this building is not included in this bill and is not included in the next bill, some other building will have to be delayed that much longer, because they have already made provision for taking care of this one this year.

Mr. MONDELL. They have made no provision at all, except that they have agreed to advance it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I did not care to say anything about this matter, but it has taken such a wide range that I think I ought to explain to the House the situation as we now have it in our committee. Members will recall that a commission was created in the last public-buildings bill, in March, 1913, to investigate this whole subject of public buildings, with the object in view of trying to see if we could not devise some plan by which we could expedite the construction of public buildings and by which we could economize in that construction. I am absolutely sure, and I think our committee is convinced, that we have been expending from fifty to sixty thousand dollars for public buildings which could be constructed for thirty or thirty-five thousand dollars just as easily, which would answer every purpose.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; for a question.

Mr. NORTON. Does the gentleman mean to say that you could build for twenty-five or thirty-five thousand dollars the same kind of building that is now being constructed for \$60,000?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not mean to say it would have all of the ornamental fixtures, and all that sort of thing, but that it would answer every practicable purpose and be just as good for the purposes of the Government; and, further, it would not overshadow all of the other buildings in the town. I think it is positively criminal to construct in the average small town a monumental building when there is nothing else in the whole country that approaches it, nothing that is anywhere near its class. It overshadows all of the others and makes everything else look shabby. I think the Government ought to build good buildings, fireproof buildings, that will answer the purpose, and when that is done I think everything is done that ought to be done.

Mr. NORTON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I can not yield now. I want to make this statement.

Now, I want to state that the commission made its report; that it was a good report; and that our committee is now working upon legislation which we expect to submit to this House as soon as we can complete it which we believe will accomplish these purposes. I want to say we have had some of the best architects in this country before us, and there is in this city to-day one of the best architects in America, with whom I am

to have a conference this afternoon for the purpose of hearing suggestions which he will make. I believe we will reach a point where we can have the work, which has already been provided for and which they say will take five or six years to complete, completed inside of two or three years at the outside. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to go into the question of the Architect's Office. It is true that there is some effort being made now at standardization, but it has not been that way all the time. The trouble heretofore has been that they have been drawing plans for every building. Now, of late they have begun to attempt standardization, but they have not accomplished very much, and it is the consensus of opinion of the best architects of this country that they can at least standardize the types of buildings. A building may not be exactly alike in every item, but it can be practically alike; and this will save oceans of time in the construction of public buildings, and will also save vast sums of money. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that we will have this legislation, I think, ready to introduce in a very few days, and we are going to ask this Congress to give the necessary time to consider it, because it means millions of money saved. We are going to ask them to pass legislation to reconstruct the Supervising Architect's Office to the end that these things may be accomplished.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. POWERS. To address myself to the subject under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the committee all debate has been closed on this amendment and all amendments thereto. For the information of the House the Chair will direct the amendment to be voted upon to be read by the Clerk.

The amendment was again reported.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the Chair was in doubt.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 34, noes 44.

Mr. KENT. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered.

The committee again divided; and the tellers (Mr. FITZGERALD and Mr. KENT) reported there were—ayes 27, noes 47.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lawton, Okla., post office and courthouse: For completion, \$152,300.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 11, at the end of line 5, insert as a new paragraph the following:

"Arkadelphia, Ark., post office, for completion, \$52,600."

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, in 1910 the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to acquire a site at Arkadelphia, Ark., for the construction of a Federal building. Shortly after that a very enterprising and public-spirited citizen there, Capt. Huie, donated a site to the Federal Government for this building, remote from other buildings, standing out by itself. The \$5,000 authorization, therefore, was reconverted into the Treasury. In 1913 the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds authorized an appropriation of \$55,000 for the building. In July of last year the public-spirited citizens of that community got together, in order to facilitate the construction of a building, and donated the plans and specifications, at a cost of about \$2,500. The amount asked for here is not the amount of the authorization, but the authorization less the donation, making \$52,600, or a saving of about 15½ per cent, including site donation as well as plans and specifications. Now, I submit in consideration of that fact, the Government owning the building, saving rent therefor, we would be justified in making this appropriation, because in the ordinary course of events this building would be ready in one year from now, should these other items in this bill become the law. Arkadelphia had postal receipts last year, all told, of \$68,000. It is a town of about 2,800 people under the general census of 1910. It has grown much since that time, and has several manufacturing enterprises bordering the town, and therefore really might be said to be a city of from 4,000 to 4,500 people, including those who live just beyond the corporate limits. It is a town where two of the largest colleges in my State are located—the Methodist College and the Baptist College, which are the State colleges of those denominations—and the present post office is a small structure, 20 by 90 feet, hemmed in about the middle of the block, with very little light, and I am informed that only about a dozen or two people can get into the office at a time on rainy days, and they have no city delivery service. It is a thrifty, up-to-date community of educated

people, and we think that inasmuch as \$7,500 has been donated by the public-spirited citizens of that community in the way of building site and plans and specifications, that deducted from the authorizations heretofore made, that that within itself should be a consideration to guarantee and warrant the adoption of this proposed amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. I will.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Did I understand the gentleman to say a few minutes ago that the gross postal receipts were \$68,000?

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Yes; I said the receipts, all told. The postal receipts proper were \$13,286, and the money-order receipts and the postal savings receipts all totaled \$68,000, as reflected by the report. I will say this, furthermore, Mr. Chairman, this item was recommended by the Treasury Department to the committee to be incorporated in this bill out of consideration for the fact that these donations have been made. In other words, they are anxious that this item be advanced in order that the building might be constructed, the site and the plans having been donated by the people. I do not care to speak at further length. I think the merits in the case are sufficient to justify a favorable vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, all I desire to say about this item is that this is one of three buildings which the Treasury Department recommended being taken up out of their order—Arkadelphia, Ark., Fordyce, Ark., and Willow, Cal. In the case of Willow, Cal., which the committee has just refused to advance, the site was donated and it was proposed to donate the plans. In this case it is proposed to donate the plans alone. The committee was opposed to advancing this building out of its order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas) there were—yeas 21, yeas 23.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mandan, N. Dak., post office: For completion, \$11,000.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, after line 19, insert:

"Dickinson, N. Dak., post office: For commencement and construction, \$25,000."

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, although this amendment has not been recommended to the committee by the Treasury Department, as the items from Arkadelphia and Willow and Fordyce have been, I trust that the committee will treat it more kindly and adopt it on its merits.

Dickinson, N. Dak., is a town considerably larger than either of the towns referred to in the former amendments. It is a very live, progressive, rapidly growing city with a population of nearly 6,000 people. Away back in the dim, distant past, in 1910, in more prosperous times apparently than the present, this Congress provided for the purchase of a site for this Federal building. The site has been purchased and the title has long since been transferred to the Federal Government. The present building used for the post office in Dickinson is a very small and inadequate one. I have taken up at different times with the Treasury Department the question of having the construction of this building begun at some early date.

Mr. SLOAN. I notice the gentleman tells what happened in the dim, distant past. Does he not think he had better wait until the dim, distant future, if he is going to refer to dim distances?

Mr. NORTON. From my inquiries at the Treasury Department I fear that unless there is some action taken by this body to improve existing conditions it will be the dim, distant future before this building will be constructed. I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question to make this subject a little more clear. As I am informed by the Supervising Architect's Office, according to present plans, the public buildings provided for in the act of March 4, 1913, will not all be completed until 1920.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know that.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] stated a few moments ago that the trouble was mainly with the Supervising Architect's Office; that if the plans were

prepared there the Committee on Appropriations would be ready to report the necessary appropriations. Now, from repeated statements made to me by the Supervising Architect and other officials in the Treasury Department I do not understand that to be the true situation. I have been told at the Supervising Architect's Office that while they are now prepared to build from 75 to 85 buildings a year, if this Congress would say that it wanted the 327 buildings that were provided for in the act of March 4, 1913, constructed within the next 12 or 18 months they would be so constructed; that the reason for the slowness in construction is because Congress does not wish to make greater appropriations than it is now making for Federal buildings. The present buildings that were provided for in the act of March 4, 1913, would take for their construction within the next two years an appropriation of more than \$40,000,000. Mr. Wenderoth, the Supervising Architect, and others in the Treasury Department, gave me to understand on several occasions that if Congress would say the word the Supervising Architect's Office would have the plans prepared to construct all these buildings within 18 months. I desire to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, if that is a correct statement of the condition or is the cause of the delay with the Supervising Architect's Office?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, if Congress provided a force that was sufficient and appropriated a sufficient amount of money, the Supervising Architect's Office could not only construct all of the buildings authorized, but a good many more than could be authorized within a certain definite time. The Supervising Architect's Office is organized to turn out between \$12,000,000 and \$15,000,000 worth of work a year. That is all it is believed it is wise to attempt to expend out of the Treasury in connection with the construction of public buildings.

Mr. NORTON. Now, I should like to ask the gentleman another question. Has the Treasury Department, to the best of the gentleman's knowledge, advanced the construction of any of the Federal buildings from the numerical rank that they have on the scheduled construction list?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It has; yes.

Mr. NORTON. Without the authority of Congress?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It could not be done without the authority of Congress, in that Congress would have to appropriate specifically for the project. For instance, there have been cases where sites have been donated, or where a building has been destroyed by fire, and appropriations have been requested for that building sooner than they would have been requested if the building were taken in its numerical order in accordance with the rules established by the Treasury Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NORTON. I ask for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks that his time be extended one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORTON. What I want to have made clear is this: The buildings provided for in the act of March 4, 1913, have numbers ranging from 1 to over 300. Has the Treasury Department the right to start the construction of building No. 200 before the construction of building No. 10 has begun?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Treasury Department can take them up in any order that it pleases, but it has established this other rule which it follows. It does that as a matter of self-preservation. It could not, however, take up a building out of its order if no appropriation were made for that building.

Mr. NORTON. One further question. I understand that, but where the appropriations are provided and made available for different buildings—

Mr. FITZGERALD. But they are not. They are made available for specific buildings.

Mr. NORTON. They are made available, of course, for specific buildings. They may be made available for buildings numbered 1 to 100.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But they are not made in that way.

Mr. NORTON. Certainly they are, by name and location of building.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman says the Treasury Department would have the right, but what I want to know and have placed in the record is this: Has it been the practice of the Treasury Department to take up buildings out of their order on the construction list?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; it has not.

Mr. AUSTIN. Except in an emergency case—unless there is absolute necessity for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has again expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask that I may have leave to insert in the RECORD a statement which I referred to earlier in the debate in the discussion with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I move to strike out the last word, and I will ask to put in the RECORD a letter under date of July 1, 1914, which is a circular letter issued by the Supervising Architect.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the letter referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

STATUS OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS CONSTRUCTION.

[Circular letter No. 16.]

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SUPERVISING ARCHITECT,
Washington, D. C., July 1, 1914.

Many requests are received for the immediate preparation of plans, etc., for particular Federal buildings which have been authorized by existing legislation, irrespective of the date of such authorization. The following statement of the present status of public-building work is issued for the information of all concerned:

Beginning with 1902, it has been the policy of Congress to authorize public buildings by what are known as omnibus acts, each act including a great many separate projects. In addition, special acts are passed from time to time providing for individual projects, increases in the limits of cost of projects previously authorized, etc. The omnibus act of 1902 was followed by similar acts in 1903, 1906, 1908, 1910, and 1913.

It is the present policy to place under contract for construction all buildings or extension to buildings authorized in any one omnibus act before beginning plans for projects authorized by a subsequent act. It is also the present practice to prepare the plans for all buildings or projects authorized in any given act in the order of the dates upon which the titles to the sites therefor were vested in the United States.

To determine the precise order in which the plans for the various buildings shall receive attention the following procedure is followed: The buildings authorized in any one act are first divided into groups according to the priority of the acts in which their sites were authorized. All buildings in each such act-group are further arranged in the order of the dates of the acquisition of their sites, the earliest date first. For instance, the 1913 act authorizes buildings upon sites which had been authorized in the act of 1908, in the act of 1910, and in the act of 1913. It is intended that the buildings so authorized in 1913 to be erected upon sites authorized in 1908 shall first be placed under contract. These will be followed by buildings authorized in 1913 to be constructed upon sites authorized in 1910. Then the buildings authorized in 1913 to be built upon sites also authorized in 1913 will take their respective turns for attention.

Extensions are usually authorized to be erected upon land already owned by the United States. While extension projects are included with the buildings authorized in a particular act, discretion is exercised in determining the order in which extensions shall be placed under contract for construction, depending upon the urgency of the need for the improvement.

The output of plans by the Supervising Architect's Office is governed by the extent of the technical force (designers, draftsmen, computers, superintendents, etc.) which the appropriations given by Congress permit the department to employ.

At this date the Office of the Supervising Architect has on its books, waiting to be placed under contract, approximately \$38,500,000 worth of authorizations for new buildings and extensions, exclusive of the value of the land. This includes the new buildings and extensions in the act of 1913. This office is placing buildings and extensions under contract at the rate of about \$7,000,000 annually, so that at the present rate of progress the last of the buildings authorized in the act of 1913 will not have been placed under contract until about the beginning of the calendar year 1920. It will not be until after the latter date that it will be possible for the Supervising Architect to place under contract any buildings contained in any act or acts which may be passed in the meantime.

The current program, made up of the remaining projects which were authorized prior to the 1913 act, includes about one year's work from this date. Work upon the plans for buildings authorized in the act of 1913 will therefore not commence until about July 1, 1915. The 1913 act contains the following authorizations:

New buildings.....	304
Extensions to existing buildings.....	23

Total projects.....	327
---------------------	-----

The program of work contained in the act of 1913 has not been laid out as yet. Therefore it is impossible to state even approximately the time when any building authorized in that act will be either advertised for bids or placed under contract.

If a subsequent act increases the limit of cost or otherwise modifies prior legislation for a building or extension before that project is reached in turn, the position of the project in the program of work is not affected thereby. If a project is set aside when its turn is reached in order to await action upon a proposed increase in the limit of cost, or for any other reason, it is taken up whenever "released" in as near its original position as the condition of the work generally may render possible.

No consideration can be given to suggestions that any one project is entitled to any more consideration than another, and requests that buildings be advanced out of their order must be uniformly declined.

For the information of those not familiar with legislative terminology it may be stated that an "authorization" is, as it implies, merely authority to acquire a site, erect a building, etc., within the limit of cost stated, and is not an actual "appropriation" of money out of the Treasury. Appropriations are made by Congress on the basis of estimates submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury. These appropriations are carried in one or the other of the annual supply acts and are intended to be only sufficient to carry forward the building program for the fiscal year to which the acts apply. "Appropriations" are made on account of the limits of cost fixed by the "authorization" and are not extensions of these limits.

All appropriations for sites, buildings, extensions, etc., are available until expended, unless repealed by act of Congress, and are not automatically returned to the Treasury if not expended before the expiration of the fiscal year.

The public-buildings act of 1913 authorized the Treasury Department to acquire sites, erect buildings, construct extensions, etc., aggregating a total cost of nearly \$42,000,000 but did not actually appropriate one cent toward the consummation of any of these projects.

O. WENDEROTH,
Supervising Architect.

Approved.

BYRON R. NEWTON,
Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That letter states exactly what the policy of the department is and the rule which it is following.

Mr. NORTON. The people of Dickinson are willing to pay for the plans for this building. They are willing to do almost anything to have the building constructed at once, because there is great and urgent need for the building. They want to know if there is anything that can be honorably done to have the time of the construction of this building advanced. If there is, they stand ready and willing to do it. I have not been able to learn of anything that can be done at the Treasury Department to secure the early construction of this much-needed building.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This building is No. 139 in the numerical list, and will probably be reached in the fiscal year 1917. The site was authorized in 1910, and the building was authorized in the public building act of 1913.

Mr. NORTON. It is 139 on the numerical list of the March 4, 1913, public-building act.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No. 139; and I shall ask unanimous consent also to place in the RECORD an alphabetical list of the order of numbers of buildings up to 149.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. If the gentleman will permit, I might say to the gentleman from North Dakota that there is a gentleman in the Treasury Department who is very high up, stands very near the throne, who has a good name, and probably he could help the gentleman in getting the building at Dickinson facilitated.

Mr. NORTON. I am sure the gentleman referred to would cheerfully do so if he could.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Now, Mr. Chairman, I call attention of the committee to the fact that an amendment is pending to appropriate for this building and advance out of its turn a building that could not be reached in the regular order during the fiscal year 1916. I hope the committee will not agree to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a list prepared showing the numerical order of buildings up to 149. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The list is as follows:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 65. Aberdeen, Wash. | 133. Fort Morgan, Colo. |
| 2. Alexandria, La., extension. | 132. Franklin, Va. |
| 75. Alliance, Nebr. | 123. Frederick, Md. |
| 46. Anoka, Minn. | 112. Fremont, Ohio. |
| 74. Antigo, Wis. | 98. Globe, Ariz. |
| 127. Arkadelphia, Ark. | 8. Greenwich, Conn. |
| 37. Ashland, Ky. | 97. Grinnell, Iowa. |
| 105. Ashland, Ohio. | 70. Hackensack, N. J. |
| 34. Attleboro, Mass. | 17. Hagerstown, Md., extension. |
| 68. Aurora, Nebr. | 141. Hammond, La. |
| 77. Bakersfield, Cal. | 119. Hiawatha, Kans. |
| 86. Barnesville, Ga. | 146. Holly Springs, Miss. |
| 100. Bartow, Fla. | 31. Hornell, N. Y. |
| 138. Basin, Wyo. | 66. Humboldt, Tenn. |
| 14. Batavia, N. Y. | 60. Huntington, Ind. |
| 122. Bay City, Tex. | 10. Huntington, W. Va., extension. |
| 145. Bayonne, N. J. | 102. Jamestown, N. Dak. |
| 116. Beeville, Tex. | 91. Jasper, Ala. |
| 53. Belton, Tex. | 49. Kalspell, Mont. |
| 137. Berlin, N. H. | 7. Kansas City, Mo., extension. |
| 94. Birmingham, Ala. | 19. Kirksville, Mo., extension. |
| 142. Bonne Terre, Mo. | 109. Laconia, N. H. |
| 30. Brenham, Tex. | 135. Lancaster, Ky. |
| 24. Brooklyn, N. Y., extension. | 147. Las Cruces, N. Mex. |
| 107. Buckhannon, W. Va. | 52. Little Falls, Minn. |
| 84. Buffalo, Wyo. | 43. Logan, Ohio. |
| 72. Burlington, N. C. | 23. Lynchburg, Va., extension. |
| 87. Caribou, Me. | 104. Madison, S. Dak. |
| 63. Chadron, Nebr. | 3. Madison, Wis. |
| 62. Charles City, Iowa. | 61. Maquoketa, Iowa. |
| 144. Charlotte, Mich. | 80. Marion, S. C. |
| 25. Chattanooga, Tenn., extension. | 134. Martin, Tenn. |
| 115. Cody, Wyo. | 16. Martinsburg, W. Va., extension. |
| 90. Columbia, S. C. | 50. Maryville, Tenn. |
| 126. De Land, Fla. | 82. McComb, Miss. |
| 139. Dickinson, N. Dak. | 129. Media, Pa. |
| 110. Douglas, Ariz. | 118. Mena, Ark. |
| 136. Dowagiac, Mich. | 18. Merrill, Wis. |
| 125. Dubois, Pa. | 78. Middletown, Conn. |
| 108. Durango, Colo. | 15. Middletown, Ohio. |
| 93. East Orange, N. J. | 42. Minden, La. |
| 21. East St. Louis, Ill., extension. | 26. Missoula, Mont., extension. |
| 55. Ellensburg, Wash. | 27. Moberly, Mo., extension. |
| 148. El Paso, Tex. | 79. Montevideo, Minn. |
| 44. Elyria, Ohio. | 22. Muskegon, Mich., extension. |
| 20. Evansville, Ind., extension. | 41. Nacogdoches, Tex. |
| 47. Falls City, Nebr. | 5. Nashville, Tenn., extension. |
| 128. Fordyce, Ark. | |

- 36. Naugatuck, Conn.
- 33. Navasota, Tex.
- 88. Neenah, Wis.
- 32. New Braunfels, Tex.
- 117. Newburyport, Mass.
- 4. Newport, R. I.
- 12. Oakland, Cal., extension.
- 11. Oklahoma, Okla., extension.
- 131. Orlando, Fla.
- 111. Pottstown, Pa.
- 13. Poughkeepsie, N. Y., extension.
- 85. Pulaski, Va.
- 143. Reading, Mass.
- 76. Redfield, S. Dak.
- 113. Richfield, Utah.
- 38. Ridgway, Pa.
- 89. Rockville, Conn.
- 83. Roseburg, Oreg.
- 81. Rumford, Me.
- 54. St. Louis, Mo., subtreasury.
- 39. Salamanca, N. Y.
- 6. Sandusky, Ohio.
- 95. Savanna, Ill.
- 106. Seattle, Wash.
- 58. Seymour, Conn.
- 71. Shelby, N. C.
- 51. Shelbyville, Ky.
- 48. Sidney, Ohio.
- 104. Skowhegan, Me.
- 73. South Bethlehem, Pa.
- 103. South Boston, Va.
- 92. Stamford, Tex.
- 121. Statesboro, Ga.
- 9. Syracuse, N. Y.
- 64. Tarentum, Pa.
- 56. Taylorville, Ill.
- 40. Titusville, Pa.
- 114. Twin Falls, Idaho.
- 1. Utica, N. Y., extension.
- 45. Valley City, N. Dak.
- 59. Vancouver, Wash.
- 29. Van Wert, Ohio.
- 124. Wahoo, Nebr.
- 101. Warrenton, Va.
- 99. Washington, Ind.
- 57. Washington, Iowa.
- 35. Waterloo, N. Y.
- 149. Waynesboro, Va.
- 69. Waynesville, N. C.
- 67. Wenatchee, Wash.
- 96. Williamson, W. Va.
- 28. Winchester, Ky., extension.
- 130. Woodbury, N. J.
- 120. Yoakum, Tex.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The proposed amendment is for the commencement of a new building that has not been commenced or reached in its turn by the architect's office. Of course the gentleman from North Dakota is entirely within his right in urging to the best of his ability the construction of a building in his district and in urging the needs that his town has for the construction of the building. The only ray of hope in the situation for him is that his item will come about 1917, and it will be incumbent on his constituents to recognize that fact and that he will have to have another term in order to get that building. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. And he is making a record.

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; he is making a record, and that is a delightful thing to do. If we take a sensible view of this situation, if we could get rid of all local influences, which we can not do, we should strike out all the items for the commencement of any building this year. There is no reason on earth why nine-tenths of the buildings should be commenced. In the first place, we have ample work on hand to keep the Supervising Architect of the Treasury busy. I will venture to say that in nine cases out of ten these new buildings will take the place of rented post offices where the rent will not pay the janitor's service in cleaning the new building after it is constructed. In short, we will be substituting a continuing liability on the Government for the construction, care, and maintenance of the buildings, which in a great many instances is greater than the total amount of the rent paid out. This is in addition to the investment of the money and the loss of interest thereon. This is a constantly increasing burden that you are throwing upon the Government, and then you run out and tell the people that you are going to economize. Where are you going to economize when you continue to put fixed charges on the Government? Every time anything comes up that looks like it had any faint ray of popularity everybody jumps up and votes for appropriations, and in most cases the creation of new bureaus and executive branches and so on are continuing expenses, getting larger and larger every year, and then you have to go out and say there is no money to pay these liabilities.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman says that in many cases the rent now being paid by the Government for post offices would not pay interest on the investment.

Mr. BORLAND. I did not say "interest on the investment." I said "the caretaking of the building." We know it would not pay the interest on the investment. I venture to say that in this case the rent the Government pays is less than the interest on the investment.

Mr. NORTON. Does not the gentleman think that in the Kansas City case the caretaking and the interest on the investment will be greater than is now paid for rent?

Mr. BORLAND. That is not true, and I can demonstrate it. The Government is paying \$12,000 or \$15,000 rent for Government offices outside of the present building. I want to say the biggest item for commencement of buildings is this Kansas City extension building.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman believes in economizing away from home rather than at home.

Mr. BORLAND. No; I do not. As I say, the biggest item in this bill is for the Kansas City extension. I know it is needed in the near future, but I am not making a special plea for it now.

Mr. NORTON. And the gentleman must concede that I know the item I ask for is very badly needed.

Mr. BORLAND. How much rent is paid by the Government in Dickinson?

Mr. NORTON. I can not say exactly.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman is advocating a proposition and does not know how much the Government is paying for accommodations in that town.

Mr. NORTON. I know that if it is paying very much for the present post-office accommodations there it is paying too much, as the rooms now being used for the post office are wholly unsuitable for that purpose.

Mr. BORLAND. How does that compare with the cost of the investment? The gentleman is asking the Government to make an investment and he is not prepared to tell the House how much rent the Government is now paying.

Mr. NORTON. I am not prepared to tell the gentleman accurately how much is being paid for rent, light, and heat for the post office, but I know other departments of the Government are represented there. A local land office is located there and the Department of Agriculture has representatives in that particular territory.

Mr. BORLAND. How much are the postal receipts in the town of Dickinson?

Mr. NORTON. The postal receipts for the last four quarters were \$16,135.96.

Mr. BORLAND. And how much is the appropriation the gentleman is asking for?

Mr. NORTON. Twenty-five thousand dollars now; a total appropriation of \$90,000 has been authorized.

Mr. BORLAND. Five thousand dollars interest on an investment where you have postal receipts of only \$16,000.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri was looking at this side when he said, "You talk about economizing." We have during this administration about given up any hope of economizing on this side.

Mr. BORLAND. I knew you were not aiding, but I did not know that you had given it up.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I want to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he thinks it is necessary to appropriate \$2,000,000 to urge the construction of a railroad toward the North Pole?

Mr. BORLAND. That is getting pretty far away from the discussion.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The gentleman was talking about items that might be eliminated.

Mr. BORLAND. I think it would be wise to eliminate the commencement of all public-building construction this year. I want to say to gentlemen also that you have got to face this same demand next winter that you are facing now, and you are that much closer to the election than you are now. If you would happen to get your post office for Dickinson, you would have another demand in your district next winter that you would have to meet, because you will have an election coming on very soon.

Mr. NORTON. Is that the way the gentleman figures on his appropriation for Kansas City?

Mr. BORLAND. No; I do not figure on that at all, as I have said to the gentleman several times.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Millville, N. J., post office: For continuation, \$25,000.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 19, page 12, insert the following as a new paragraph: "Statesboro, Ga.: For completion, \$50,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on that. Have we not already voted on that proposition?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is under the impression that the committee has already voted on the proposition.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard briefly on the point or order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered before was to commence the building, and this is for the completion of the building.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels that it is subject to the point of order, as the committee has already passed on the question. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rockville, Conn., post office: For commencement, \$1,000.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question, with reference to the item contained in lines 23 and 24, "Rockville, Conn., for commencement, \$1,000." Why the variance in the amounts allowed for the commencement of different buildings?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this is a building for which the department, toward the close of the fiscal year 1916, will be prepared to commence to take up the preparation of plans. In order to prepare the plans it is necessary to make a survey of the site, to make certain examinations, to determine the character of the subsoil. This \$1,000 is appropriated for that purpose. It is not expected that it will be possible to put this building under contract before the time the next appropriation bill becomes a law, and that bill, it is expected, will carry the additional money to carry on the work. If this appropriation were not included for this and the other 35 buildings for which \$1,000 is recommended, the Supervising Architect's Office would come to a standstill in 1917. This building is No. 89 on the list, and will be reached toward the end of the fiscal year 1916.

Mr. LONERGAN. I notice that larger sums are appropriated for commencing the construction of other buildings. Will the gentleman please explain why.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Where a larger sum is carried it is because it is expected that construction will be begun on the contract, and payments must be made to meet the terms of the contract.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

St. Louis, Mo., subtreasury: For commencement, \$50,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. This paragraph is for the commencement of a subtreasury building at St. Louis. When that building was authorized the subtreasury system was in full operation, and had not yet been in any way affected either in fact or prospectively or by the law creating the Federal reserve banking system. It is true that the subtreasuries have not yet been abolished, but I take it that it is expected within a reasonable time that the Federal reserve banks and their branches will perform the work now performed by the subtreasuries. I think that that is in contemplation. It looks as though if we have to make economies, we might properly wait at least for a year before we commence the construction of a new subtreasury building in any city. The chances are that if this subtreasury building be commenced, it will not be finished for several years, and before the building is completed the subtreasury will have been abolished.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. What is the authorization?

Mr. MANN. The item is \$50,000 for commencement of the subtreasury building. What the total of the limitation is I do not know.

Mr. FOSTER. One million three hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The site authorized in 1910 was to cost \$300,000 and the building is to cost \$1,000,000.

Mr. MANN. The building is to cost \$1,000,000. Mr. Chairman, it will not hurt anyone if we wait a year to ascertain whether the Federal reserve banks are to do the work that is now being done by the subtreasuries.

When we passed that bill through the House I think it was the belief on the part of the House that the new banking system would be able to do and would do eventually the work now done by the subtreasuries. They have in contemplation in the Federal reserve bank system some kind of a clearing house for the various banks. The subtreasuries in a way act as clearing houses, as far as Federal expenditures and receipts are concerned. I have no doubt that sooner or later, and not very long distant in the future, the payments by the Government, instead of being made by drafts or checks or otherwise upon the subtreasuries, will be made through the Federal reserve banks. We now have two fiscal systems in the Government. It takes some time to amalgamate those, but I believe that the Federal Reserve Board will make recommendations which will carry into effect the amalgamation. Certainly we do not need to commence a million-dollar building at this time, when the Lord only knows where the money is coming from.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations, both last year and this year, endeavored to obtain an expression of opinion from the Treasury Department as to whether it would be necessary to continue the Independent Treasury system by reason of the establishment of the Federal reserve banking system. The department was unable to give any definite information. It would seem as if most of the functions of the Independent Treasury system will be absorbed by

the Federal reserve banks. There was some doubt created as to the necessity of maintaining forces at the various subtreasuries now existing in some of the cities in the United States because of the existence of the Federal reserve system. Whether it is advisable to start this building at this time is a matter for the committee to determine. It was authorized at a time when the Federal reserve system was not in contemplation, with the expectation that the Independent Treasury system would have necessity for the accommodations provided in the bill authorized for this purpose. There can be no very great pressing necessity for the building for the purpose intended at this time, and I am perfectly willing to let the matter rest with the sound discretion of the committee as to what it is advisable to do.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask unanimous consent that this item be passed over in the absence of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOTT] who appeared before our committee and seemed to be very anxious about it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know what Member might be particularly interested in it, but in the consideration of this bill, Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to defer action on items to be inserted or eliminated to suit the convenience of Members.

Mr. AUSTIN. It is quite a common occurrence for the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and other chairmen of committees to pass over items and to return to them before the bill is finally passed. I think it is a matter of courtesy which might well be extended to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman can make the request. I shall not object myself.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this item be passed over informally until the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOTT] can be present.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Until when?

Mr. AUSTIN. Until to-morrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call attention of the committee to the unanimous-consent agreement that after the bill has been read down to page 22 the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] was authorized to offer an amendment dealing with all of these provisions in the bill. Now, the Chair simply desires to call attention to the proposition whether or not the proposition of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] will have effect if this unanimous-consent agreement is entered into. That is a matter for the committee to determine.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am glad to see the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] has just come into the Chamber again, and I am sure if he had been here and his attention had been called to this item of \$50,000 for the commencement of a subtreasury in Missouri, in line with his policy of economy—outside of Kansas City—he would here on this floor voice his sentiments to have this item stricken from the bill. As the gentleman from Illinois has stated, there is no reason at this time why the commencement of a subtreasury building should be begun now anywhere in this country, involving a final expenditure of a million dollars. This item could well be stricken out of the bill and meritorious items pertaining to buildings in smaller towns in different sections of the country might be well substituted in its stead.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] asks unanimous consent that the item on page 17, line 14, subtreasury for St. Louis, Mo., be passed over until to-morrow.

Mr. FITZGERALD. With the understanding, Mr. Chairman, that it does not affect the right of the gentleman from Massachusetts to offer an amendment striking out all included under the head of public buildings.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the proviso. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Washington, D. C., building, Interior Department offices: For continuation, \$1,500,000.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York, how much that building for the Interior Department is to cost? This item reads "for continuation," \$1,500,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Two million five hundred thousand dollars, as I recall it.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding—and I ask the gentleman from New York whether I am correct—that it is proposed to erect this building on F Street, two or three squares west of the State, War, and Navy Building?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; west of the State, War, and Navy Building.

Mr. COOPER. On F Street, two or three squares west?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, that is a most extraordinary location for a building for the Interior Department. It is an out-of-the-way place, not at all in harmony with the plan for the improvement of the city of Washington and utterly inappropriate as a site for the home of the Department of the Interior. I can not conceive why that site was selected for this particular building. It was bought originally as a site for a hall of records. The Government needed and still badly needs a hall of records, for it has many priceless documents and records which if destroyed could not be replaced. Their preservation is of the utmost importance and requires a building—a hall of records—which shall be absolutely fireproof, if such a building can be constructed. As Members of the Senate and House would seldom be called upon to visit it, it might occupy the site in question, although, in my judgment, it would be much better to locate it strictly in accordance with the plan for the improvement of Washington.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I will.

Mr. BRYAN. Is it not a fact that the Interior Department is the department that requires more visitation by Members than perhaps any other department of the Government?

Mr. COOPER. Yes. I was just about to remark that. Here is the department to which Members are constantly required to go, and yet it is proposed to place this new building at about as inaccessible, inconvenient a point as could well be found. The location will be good for the street-car companies, but very inconvenient for the Members of the Senate and the House. Now, years ago the Government condemned and purchased, and has ever since owned, the square on which Poli's Theater is located, and all the squares between that square and the Mall. These squares are unsurpassed as building sites. The Government bought them for the purpose, as the law expressly provided, of erecting on them three buildings—one for the Department of Justice, one for the Department of the Interior, and one for the Department of State. For years all of these buildings have been greatly needed, and to-day all are greatly needed. The Government is expending \$600,000 a year, perhaps a little more, for rentals for public buildings in the city of Washington. Six hundred thousand dollars a year is 3 per cent on \$20,000,000. The Government can borrow money at 3 per cent and less. Plans were completed for the construction of these three department buildings on those squares, at a total cost of only \$8,000,000; but none of these buildings has been erected, and to my amazement, and I think it must be to the amazement of a large majority of the membership of the House, we find it now proposed that one of them shall be constructed on a site two or three blocks west of the building of the State, War, and Navy Departments—a site remote, inconvenient, awkward to reach, and which was originally bought as a site for a hall of records.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Can the gentleman inform us who makes these selections? I entirely agree with what the gentleman has said.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. COOPER. If the gentleman from New York will wait—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. In just a moment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But at this point.

Mr. COOPER. If the gentleman will pardon me, I prefer to have him come in a little later.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I did not want the gentleman to labor under a misapprehension.

Mr. COOPER. I want to call attention to some evidence which, together with much other of similar sort, helped to convince me that there is a well-established industry in this city having for its prime object the renting of privately constructed buildings to the Government of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOPER. I ask for five minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COOPER. When the sundry bill was up last year the distinguished leader of the minority [Mr. MANN] made a very suggestive disclosure. I pause to say that we all ought to thank him for the way in which he keeps watch over public expenditures. I never have seen any other man in any legislative body who does the work or has done the work which he has in this regard. [Applause.] His services are invaluable in these matters.

In the second session of the Sixty-third Congress the gentleman from Illinois referred to the location of the new privately owned building then recently occupied by the Department of Commerce, on Pennsylvania Avenue at Nineteenth Street. His remarks are found on page 11274 of the RECORD for that session. Before reading what he said I desire to direct attention to a

few relevant facts. You will remember that Nineteenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue is only two or three blocks from where it is now proposed to locate this new building for the Interior Department, to be occupied by hundreds of Government employees. Plainly there is being developed a new locality for Government buildings and for dwellings and boarding houses to house employees and for other structures necessary for their accommodation. If not, then I ask anybody why are those great departments sent to those remote, inaccessible places, putting Members of the Senate and the House to great and unnecessary inconvenience? Every person knows that the time of Members of each House of Congress is well taken up now by their legitimate duties on Capitol Hill, and that it is a time-consuming task to go from office to office in the widely scattered departments. For example, observe the location of the House Office Building, of the Agricultural Department, of the Pension Office, of the Department of Commerce, of the Department of Justice, of the Patent Office, and of the proposed new Department of the Interior.

But to return to the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. In speaking of the bill authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to enter into a lease for a building to be erected for the use of the Census Office, and to adjoin the then newly rented building of the Department of Commerce, on Pennsylvania Avenue away out at Nineteenth Street, the gentleman from Illinois said:

As it passed the House it provided for 35 cents a square foot. After the provision had passed the House, it being subject to a point of order at the time it first came before the House, I received information and called it to the attention of the House that the private secretary of the Secretary of Commerce, and I believe the chief clerk of the Secretary of Commerce, and some other of the high officials of the department were interested in business with the person who was to put up the building.

A private secretary, a chief clerk, and other high officials of the department interested in business with the person who is to put up a building to be rented to the Government to be used by that Department!

Gradually we are learning how it happens that the Government rents private buildings in these outlandishly inconvenient places. For years the Government has possessed many sites, any of which would be convenient and in every way admirable for the new building for the Interior Department—vastly better than the site on which it is proposed to locate it.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], whose statement no one attacked, further said:

The building is now under construction, apparently with very certain assurance that the lease will be entered into, although the authority has not yet been granted by Congress. Having passed the House at 35 cents a square foot, they succeeded in getting the Senate to raise the amount to 37½ cents a square foot.

Thereupon the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] rose and said that the Government could again rent the Census Building at the foot of Capitol Hill at the rate of 16 cents a square foot.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOPER. I think I will ask for three minutes more, because of the very great importance of this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that his time be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Now I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. What I intended to say is inappropriate at this point.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Will the gentleman tell us how far it is from the House Office Building to the place where this new building is in contemplation?

Mr. COOPER. From the House Office Building to where this building is to be located is, I think, in the neighborhood of a mile and three-quarters.

Mr. NORTON. Just about.

Mr. COOPER. In the roundabout way in which we have to go. Now, as I say, the location of public buildings and the renting of them by private individuals to the Government is getting to be a very considerable industry in this city. The three buildings for which we have the sites and for which plans were drawn—one for the Department of Justice, now housed in an inconvenient and inaccessible private dwelling on K Street; another for the Interior Department, and another for the State Department—could all have been built for \$8,000,000. We are paying \$600,000 for rents each year; that is 3 per cent on \$20,000,000.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. Can the gentleman inform the committee why it is that the original plans for which those blocks of ground on this side of the White House property were bought are not being used for the purposes for which they were bought?

Mr. COOPER. I do not know. If the Department of Justice were located at Pennsylvania Avenue and Fifteenth Street, and the other buildings on the squares toward the Mall, in accordance with the plan for the improvement of Washington, not only would the effect be beautiful, but the public convenience would also be well served.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. The gentleman will take into consideration the fact that it costs quite a considerable sum to employ messengers to go from one of these buildings to the others.

Mr. COOPER. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Who determines where these buildings are to be erected?

Mr. COOPER. I do not know. The remarkable thing is that somebody somewhere was authorized to make a lease for 10 years for that Department of Commerce Building out at the corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and Nineteenth Street. In my judgment that transaction was without justification; but this proposition to locate the Department of the Interior over west of the State, War, and Navy Building is worse.

Mr. PLATT. Is it not a fact that a good many of the Secretaries and men who occupy these offices generally prefer offices in modern office buildings rather than these architectural structures that are built by the Government?

Mr. COOPER. That is not it at all. I am not talking about the style of architecture. I am talking about the location.

Mr. PLATT. They have to put these skyscrapers out of the way, so that they will not interfere with the beautification of the city.

Mr. COOPER. I do not think that any sensible person would prefer going into a skyscraper at Nineteenth Street rather into a commodious, well-appointed building on Fifteenth Street facing the park.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I was one of the Members of the House who opposed the public-building bill of 1913. I do not know whether the gentleman from Wisconsin opposed it or not.

Mr. COOPER. I did not know anything about this until a week ago. It may have been in that bill, but, if so, it escaped my attention entirely.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is one thing that I suggested, that the bill should have been considered as other bills were, so that Members might know what was in it. Many Members interested in one item do not pay any attention to other items in the bill, and then come in, after they have waked up, years after, and protest against them. It is locking the stable after the horse is stolen.

I not only antagonized the bill when it was in the House, but I protested against its approval by the President of the United States. President Taft is now making speeches on economy and writing articles for the popular magazines on economy. When the contest was on over this bill current rumor at the time had it that his ultimatum was that if the bill was not to receive his veto it had to provide for four items—one, the Rock Creek item, the archives building, the Geological Survey building for the Department of the Interior, and the other, if I recall correctly, the Arlington memorial item. Those items only involved a total expenditure of \$6,500,000. When I protested to President Taft about the approval of the public-building bill, just before he was about to leave office, he said, "Oh, there were so many things in the bill that peculiarly benefited Washington that I could not forego an opportunity to have them authorized."

Now he is writing articles about economy and criticizing Congress for not economizing, when he had the power to do more effective work in that direction by refusing his approval of bills than anybody within my recollection.

There is one thing about this proposed building, however, that commends it to me. It provides for the construction of a building of the modern office-building type. It prohibits the construction of a building of a so-called monumental character. The public buildings erected for the Government of the United States, so far as my observation has gone, because of the attempt to make them of a monumental character, has made them more inapt for governmental purposes than any buildings that could possibly be designed unless somebody deliberately drew plans for a mausoleum. [Laughter.] It has made more waste space, more useless arrangements, and more money expended wastefully, of no serviceable return to the Government, than in most any other way.

In 1903 the site upon which this building is to be erected was purchased by the Government. I do not know whether the gentleman from Wisconsin recalls the rumors current at that time, but there was that terrific insistence upon the purchase of this particular site for a hall of records building. After the site was purchased that was the only part of it that persons were interested in, and the site was unoccupied for 10 years. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds decided that it would utilize that site in authorizing this building and provided that it should be upon it.

I do not know that it is so inconvenient. Any place in Washington is sufficiently convenient for Members of Congress. I think it would be a good thing if all public buildings were so far away from the Capitol that it would compel Members of Congress to stay here rather than to spend their time in the departments. If placing the buildings in these so-called inaccessible places would make Members remain here rather than spend their time around the departments, another good would be accomplished not contemplated when the buildings were authorized.

Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of defending the location of public buildings. The site which the gentleman from Wisconsin refers to upon Fifteenth Street was purchased in order to permit the erection of three public buildings—one for the Department of State, one for the Department of Justice, and one for the Departments of Commerce and Labor. So that this building could not have been located there. I know it would have been entirely impossible to have provided for the erection of an office type of building at that point.

Now, in reference to the rented offices for the Census Bureau, I was one of those who thought that the old Census Bureau Building was a very satisfactory building and could have been rented very cheaply, but the information presented to Congress as to the terrible danger from fire, the insanitary condition of the building, the excess of heat of the building in summer time, and the great inconvenience in the transaction of public business finally overwhelmed me, as it did other members of the committee, and the authorization was made to rent the building to be erected under certain conditions. I know that it is a very fruitful industry in the city of Washington to erect buildings for the use of the Government, and yet in a majority of these cases in which contracts of that character have been made, while it has been a profitable transaction to those who erected the buildings, I think it has been a profitable transaction in most instances for the Government, because we have had provided office buildings suitable for the transaction of Government business rather than having invested our money in so-called monumental types of building, with a very large permanent annual charge on the Treasury and very unsatisfactory conveniences for the transaction of business.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I fully approve of what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Cooper] has said with reference to the location of this building. I think when that site was originally acquired it was largely for the purpose of cleaning out a sore spot that somebody did not like. Whether that was desirable or not I would not undertake to say.

I rose particularly to again call the attention of the House to the fact that the public-building act of 1913 is not a law, although we proceed upon the supposition that it is. It is true it received the signature of the President of the United States and also of the Speaker of the House and of the President of the Senate. We passed the public-building bill through this body. The Senate added a large number of amendments to it. On a conference report we agreed to three of those items. The House never agreed to any of the other items that are incorporated in the act. We had disagreed to all of them in the first instance, as a matter of form in the House. Through an inadvertence the Speaker had presented to him a copy of the enrolled bill as having passed both bodies. He signed it. It was sent to the Senate and the President of the Senate signed it. It was sent to the President of the United States and the President of the United States signed it; but the Journal of the House, which is the official record of the proceedings in the House, shows that the Senate amendments were never agreed to, and there was no accord reached between the two bodies. I believe that some time after the adjournment of Congress the Senate Journal was doctored up, and I say "doctored up" advisedly, to show that there was a conference report presented to that body covering all of the items. There had been one presented once before and it was rejected. There never was any other presented to the Senate, but the Journal of the House shows conclusively that that bill never passed this body. I do not know how far the fact that the Speaker signs a bill which was never introduced, that the Vice President signs a bill that

has not been introduced, and that the President of the United States attaches his signature to a bill that has never been introduced in either body goes to make it a law, but I am very confident that this is subject to attack in a proper manner.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The United States Supreme Court decided that it would not go behind the certificates of the Vice President and the Speaker in a case involving the construction of the Dingley law, in which it was claimed Congress had not passed a certain provision but had authorized the conferees to incorporate it. I will put a reference to that case in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will read the case he will find that it does not apply to this case. I read that case, and I am afraid that my friend has not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I read the case, and I know that Mr. Justice Harlan in the opinion points out specifically that the court will not go behind a certificate of the presiding officers.

Mr. MANN. They will not unless you appeal to the Journal of the two bodies.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will get the case and put it in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can get the case and put the reference in the RECORD. I know what it is, for I read the case.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. In reference to the criticism of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] on the Interior Department Building, in the course of construction beyond the State, War, and Navy Building, I wish to say that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds gave that department the character of building that it requested. It was a new departure in Washington City, a great deal of this work was shop work, and the officials of that department insisted upon that character of building, and we gave them what they wanted.

In reference to the amount of rent expended in this city for public buildings, it is true that it approaches \$600,000, but Congress can, whenever it feels so disposed, make an appropriation to give the Government the necessary housing room for all of its departments. The Department of Commerce was overcrowded in its building on Fourteenth Street between the Ebbitt House and Pennsylvania Avenue. That department had a number of its bureaus scattered over the city in rented quarters, and hence they made this agreement for the construction by private parties of a building sufficiently large to house all of its various bureaus on Pennsylvania Avenue at the corner of Nineteenth Street.

In reference to the lots purchased by the Government at the head of Pennsylvania Avenue and opposite the Treasury Department, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has reported—and there is now on the calendar—a bill providing for the construction of a building for the Department of Justice on a portion of that land, to cost \$3,000,000, and carrying an immediate appropriation of \$500,000 for the commencement of the work.

Before we prepared the last public-buildings bill we conferred with President Taft in reference to the amount which that bill should carry. The House committee held its down practically within the limits suggested by the President of the United States. We found it utterly impossible to care for more of the Government propositions in the District of Columbia and at the same time carry in that bill the needed propositions in practically every State in the Union. We gave what we thought was a just amount for public buildings in Washington City within the limits of the total amount authorized in the bill and at the same time provide for meritorious propositions in the various States.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What was the agreement between the gentleman and the President?

Mr. AUSTIN. It was not an agreement. It was simply to ascertain from the President of the United States how much he would stand for in a public-building bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. He also insisted that he would veto the bill unless certain items were included in it?

Mr. AUSTIN. He did not. When our subcommittee, I think composed of Messrs. CLARK, BURNETT, and myself, visited the White House, I will be very frank to say, I think I suggested to the other members of that subcommittee that we ask the President if he had any suggestion to make as to any proposition which should be included in a bill. I thought he would want the Red Cross building embraced in the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That was not in that bill, was it?

Mr. AUSTIN. I said, "Let us offer him something and get him interested in it and get as large a bill as we can." [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. As a matter of fact, he served notice when the vote was on in the Senate and there was a controversy between the two Houses that there were things that he wanted in that bill?

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not know what occurred in the Senate, but I know that the President of the United States did not seek to dictate to our subcommittee.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not say that he did.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I first yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have reference to another stage in the proceedings.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I was with the subcommittee that waited upon President Taft, and there was not an intimation made by him that the condition of his signature to that bill would depend on whether he got any item.

Mr. AUSTIN. No.

Mr. BURNETT. Not a thing of the kind.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not talking about that particular stage of the proceedings.

Mr. BURNETT. The fact is President Taft stated to us that he would stand for a bill of a certain size, and that he was interested in a building he would like very much to have us make an appropriation for, which, as I recollect, we had already agreed upon, which building was in a city where he was expecting to be a professor in a college, but so far as ever mentioning that until after he had told us his desires in regard to the matter, that is actually untrue, so far as that committee is concerned. I do not know anything about what occurred in the Senate.

Mr. FITZGERALD. He was well taken care of, and more than that, after he left the White House he came down to Washington and used whatever influence he had with the Treasury Department to have them spend \$100,000 or \$150,000 for the use of one particular kind of marble instead of another in the New Haven building.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as most of my time has been consumed by my genial colleagues I will ask to have my time extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] is correct in his statement of what ex-President Taft stated to our subcommittee. The President made a reference to an increased appropriation for the New Haven post office and customhouse, which had been recommended by the architect.

Mr. BURNETT. That is correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. Now, in reference to the ex-President of the United States coming to Washington and exercising his influence for a certain kind of material for the post-office building and customhouse at Hartford, Conn., I do not know of any such fact.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do.

Mr. AUSTIN. But I do know that I wrote the ex-President of the United States and appealed to him to use his influence for the use of a certain kind of material for the post-office building in his town.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Was that the kind adopted?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; and it was the best material offered.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And that cost between \$100,000 and \$150,000 more than the building could have been constructed for if a different type of material had been used.

Mr. AUSTIN. Well, it was a question of the value and durability of the kind of material to be used in the New Haven building. It was quite a question whether to use marble from New York or Tennessee—

Mr. FITZGERALD. And the New York marble would have lasted as long as we or our children would live.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Tennessee marble was worth \$150,000 more than the New York marble. The architect who prepared the plans recommended Tennessee marble. There was not any doubt about the Government receiving full value in the difference of those two bids or materials.

Mr. CANTRILL. What part of Tennessee did this marble come from?

Mr. AUSTIN. It comes from the Garden of Eden, the district which I have the honor to represent. [Applause.] I not only appealed to Mr. Taft, but I went to see the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo, any number of times in reference to this matter. I take full responsibility, and hope I will have another opportunity in doing the same thing.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman from Tennessee says that President Taft did not call on him. From his position in matters of this sort, it would not be necessary for ex-President Taft to call on the gentleman from Tennessee to induce him to reduce any kind of an appropriation, would it?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; I believe in putting money in circulation instead of hoarding it in the Treasury.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the case to which I referred a moment ago in reply to the gentleman from Illinois is *Field v. Clark* (143 U. S., 649), and the headnote is as follows:

The signing by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and by the President of the Senate, in open session, of an enrolled bill is an official attestation by the two Houses of such bill as one that has passed Congress; and when the bill thus attested receives the approval of the President and is deposited in the Department of State according to law, its authentication as a bill that has passed Congress is complete and unimpeachable.

It is not competent to show from the journals of either House of Congress that an act so authenticated, approved, and deposited did not pass in the precise form in which it was signed by the presiding officers of the two Houses and approved by the President.

An examination of the opinion in this case, though I have not read it recently, but read it some time ago when I was interested in another phase of a similar question, will show that Mr. Justice Harlan took the ground that the Supreme Court will not go behind the attestation of the presiding officers and examine the Journal, the records of the two Houses, to impeach a bill as approved after being attested to by the two presiding officers.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I read the case and I think it did not cover the case in reference to the public buildings bill at all.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not know how it could be any more explicit than it is.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from New York how much construction work has been done on this site? As I understand it, there has been none done as yet.

Mr. FITZGERALD. My recollection is that part of the unexpended balance on the site, \$96,000, was unexpended of the original \$400,000 appropriated for this site and the authorization for the building, placing the limit of cost at \$2,596,000. In the sundry civil act for the current year \$40,000 of the unexpended balance was appropriated for the preparation of plans and this is the first appropriation toward the construction of the work.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will consider the pro forma amendment as withdrawn and the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, strike out lines 11 and 12.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because, in my judgment, it would be a very serious mistake to erect a building for the Interior Department in such a remote and inconvenient place. The site was bought originally, as the gentleman from Illinois said, to get rid of some things that the city wanted to get rid of and to be used for the purpose of a hall of records, which the Government then very greatly needed and still needs. This building for the Interior Department will be one to which more Members must go than to any other single departmental building in the city. It should be constructed at some point convenient as possible for a majority of the membership of Congress. There are many sites, the one on Fifteenth Street being especially suitable. But we can now stop its construction on this inaccessible site, and do no harm to anybody. We can have a reconsideration of this very important program in the interest of the public service and of the convenience of the membership of the two Houses of Congress. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. FITZGERALD], in whose judgment we all have great confidence, said he was opposed originally to this sort of thing. Only \$40,000 has been spent and no part of that on the building. The gentleman said he wished buildings to be located at inaccessible places so that the Members of the House would remain here while the House is in session.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman overlook the fact that we have spent \$300,000 on the site?

Mr. COOPER. We can use that for a hall of records.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman said only \$40,000 had been spent on it.

Mr. COOPER. I meant, aside from the purchase of the site, only \$40,000 has been spent on it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And there is the money which has been spent for the preparation of the plans.

Mr. COOPER. Those can be very easily changed for a hall of records. When you look forward to the future of the Republic of the United States and consider the convenience of all of the Members of the two Houses of Congress who must walk or ride up there through the centuries to come, the proposition in this bill seems inexcusable.

But the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] made a statement which seems plausible and somewhat effective when he said he wanted this building put up at an inaccessible place, so that the Members of the House would stay here during the sessions of the House. It is my experience, and I think it is the experience of the gentleman himself—and he is one of the most faithful of the membership of this House—that he does his department work in the morning after breakfast, between that time and the time he comes up to the Capitol or to the House Office Building. It is very rarely that I leave the Capitol to go to the departments in the afternoon. Sometimes I do, upon receipt of a telegram or of a letter on urgent business, but not otherwise. This is true also of the Members of Congress generally.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Is it not a fact that the Government owns a plot of ground, possibly 200 feet square, west of the Riggs Bank Building on Fifteenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue and south of the Belasco Theater? I understand that the Government owns that splendid plot of ground.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Should not the Interior Department building be located at some such place as that?

Mr. COOPER. But a much better place would be to locate it in accordance with the plan for the improvement of Washington and for the great convenience of the membership of the House, and that is—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOPER. I ask for a few minutes more.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the pending amendment be closed. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. COOPER. About three minutes, that is all—three or four.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto be closed in eight minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks that all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto close in eight minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. We have a site now which has been purchased, running, as I said, from Pennsylvania Avenue straight through to the Mall along Fifteenth Street, a site facing on the park, a beautiful site, accessible, and very admirable.

Inasmuch as no money has been spent toward the construction of this proposed building on that out-of-the-way site on F Street, and inasmuch as we are about to locate this great department for all time, we ought immediately to reconsider this proposition and choose a far better site. That would be no reflection upon the committee which brought in this appropriation. It acted in accordance with what it thought the desire of Congress. But we ought now to reconsider it. There is no pressing necessity for spending a million and a half dollars on this project while the Treasury is in its present condition. If we do not reconsider now, we never can reconsider it. Every reason which can appeal to the good judgment of the House requires us to strike out these two lines and have a reconsideration of this problem.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This building is more needed, perhaps, than any other building in Washington. It is to house certain bureaus of the Interior Department. It was urged particularly because of the fact that the Geological Survey is now housed in a building where several fires have threatened the destruction of very valuable documents.

This building is proposed to be erected on the lot bounded by Seventeenth and Eighteenth and E and F Streets. It is right in a cluster of public offices. The State, War, and Navy Building is on Seventeenth Street. The Department of Labor is occupying the Mills Building at Seventeenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. The Department of Commerce is at Nineteenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. NORTON. How long have the Department of Commerce and the Department of Labor been up there on Seventeenth Street?

Mr. COOPER. Two years.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Department of Commerce went up there about a year and a half ago, I think. The Civil Service Commission is in that vicinity, and also the Navy Department

Annex, so that this building is to be located in the midst of a group of public buildings.

This building is needed for the public service. To strike out this item, for the purpose of enabling Congress to reconsider it, means that offices which are particularly desired in the interest of the public service must be delayed. It is believed that the building will be completed within two years. It is needed for the public service, and I think it ought to be constructed now.

Mr. COOPER. All these buildings which the gentleman mentions are leased buildings, built by private parties and leased to the Government.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The State, War, and Navy Building is not.

Mr. COOPER. All the rest are.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; and most of them are rented on terms which are quite advantageous to the Government. This building proposes something that many Members of Congress believe may be the beginning of a system that will result in a very different type of public building. Here is a proposal to erect a structure of the modern office-building type for the transaction of the public business. It will be economical, it will be useful, it will be satisfactory. The only time when we get such buildings is when we rent them. This is one time when we can get such a building under Government construction. The buildings are required for the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey. These two services are now paying \$52,000 a year rent in the city of Washington. The more speedily this building is erected for all the services that are to go into it the better it is for the service.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COOPER) there were—ayes 27, noes 33.

So the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

Wenatchee, Wash., post office: For commencement, \$1,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Wilmington, N. C., customhouse and appraisers' stores: For continuation, \$220,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from New York if he is able to tell us how much the authorization is for this Wilmington, N. C., building.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Wilmington, N. C., the total limit of cost is \$600,000.

Mr. MANN. May I ask what is covered by the next item, "For rent of temporary quarters for the accommodation of Government officials and moving expenses incident thereto, \$2,500"? Who are these officials to be accommodated? I assume, without knowing, that the Wilmington customhouse is to be erected on the site where there is now a Government building, and that you appropriate \$2,500 for the rent of buildings for these officials during the erection of that building.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is intended to commence the removal of the old building from its present site and commence the construction of a new building, and this is to provide accommodations for offices in another building while the new building is being constructed.

Mr. MANN. I may be in error as to the facts, but here is a case where the Government proposes to appropriate \$2,500 for the rent of private buildings for customhouse and appraisers' offices in Wilmington, N. C. They can get the rent and move the offices for \$2,500 a year, and yet we propose to construct a \$600,000 building for their accommodation hereafter. That would be a considerable sum to spend for quarters that you can rent for less than \$2,500 a year. I should say that was going some if these are the facts. Those are what appear to be the facts on the surface of the bill. Five per cent on \$600,000 a year would be \$30,000 interest, and the cost of light, heat, and janitor's services would be more than \$2,500 a year, and yet I suppose we are to build the building as a matter of economy.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Illinois refused to join with me when this bill was up, but rather helped the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to pass it, and now the gentleman criticizes it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is mistaken. He is ungrateful and his memory is poor. He is in the habit of saying "Look

at me, I tried to beat it and you were for it." The fact is that I cordially joined with the gentleman from New York, and I was one of the very few who did.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is not my recollection of it.

Mr. MANN. I had an item in the bill and the gentleman from New York did not have an item in it. The gentleman opposed the bill because he did not have an item in it, and so his virtue was not so strong as mine. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is in error as to both statements. He had an item in the bill and cooperated with the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. The committee proposed to put in an item for Brooklyn, but I requested them not to put it in. The Senate inserted the item in the bill, and I asked the conferees not to agree to it. That is where the gentleman from Illinois and I differ.

Mr. MANN. Certainly; that is correct; because the item was not as the gentleman from New York wanted it. It did not carry the amount of money the gentleman wanted; it cut it too fine and the gentleman wanted more money. He did not get it. I do not criticize him. I commend him even then for being opposed to the bill, and I joined with him.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That was not the reason. The gentleman from Illinois gave his valuable assistance to the men who were interested in public buildings. I do not find fault with him, but I hope his building will not come back to plague him as some others do. I think that these gentlemen who helped to pass a public-building bill and who profited by its passage in that they got some authorization of their own in it, should not, after the bill has become a law and they have gained the advantage they seek from it, turn around and criticize and condemn their associates in passing the bill. If they want to be free to criticize these items, they ought to criticize them when they are authorized, and not wait until the bill has become a law and after their particular item has been taken care of and then turn upon their former allies.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not know how the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] voted, because there were so very few who did vote against the last public-buildings bill that I did not take much notice of it; but my understanding was that we had the moral support and cooperation of my good friend from Illinois. I flattered myself, from the few conversations I had with him in regard to the bill, that he was at heart with us. I did not think that the \$50,000 that he had in the bill influenced him in any way whatever, but I thought that for the general good of the country the gentleman from Illinois recognized it as so meritorious a bill that at heart, if not by vote, he was with us. In regard to the item, Mr. Chairman, as I recollect it, it went to the Senate with a much smaller authorization. That was increased in the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is a New York item?

Mr. BURNETT. The Wilmington proposition. The House conferees finally yielded on that, and when it comes to the amount of expenditure I think that if the gentlemen will investigate it they will find that the \$2,500 is for the payment of the housing of the Government officials till the new building is completed. Of course, I can not remember distinctly these matters that occurred two years ago, but my recollection is that part of the old building was being occupied, and is yet, by Government officials, and that this \$2,500 is made up of rents made necessary by renting of outside buildings and the moving of these offices when they do move to the new building and when it is completed. I am stating that from recollection. I may be mistaken in regard to the matter, but I think upon investigation the gentleman will find that the facts are as I have stated.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think perhaps the gentleman is correct about that. I have that information here.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if I supported upon the floor all of the propositions where I give parliamentary advice, I would very frequently find myself on both sides of the questions that come before the House. The gentleman from Alabama is a little ungrateful. I advised him how he could pass the public building bill two years ago. That was a matter of giving parliamentary advice. Only the other day he was courteous enough to ask for some parliamentary advice on another great matter that was before the House, and as far as my knowledge went I was very willing to give the advice, although I did not vote for his bill. I did not understand that when gentlemen taking advantage of my long experience upon the floor ask me for parliamentary advice, and I am courteous enough to give it to them, that they are thereby warranted in saying that I favor their bill. That is a rather ungracious statement to make.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I am sure I intended nothing of the kind. My remarks were intended to be more facetious than ungracious. I have

conferred with the gentleman about the bill generally, but I had not understood that the gentleman was opposed to the bill. Perhaps I ought not to have referred to the fact of the parliamentary suggestions which the gentleman gave me, because I frequently do go to him for parliamentary advice. It was not that that led me to believe that the gentleman was not unfriendly to the bill, so much as the fact that I had talked with him generally about the bill and he had never expressed disapproval of the bill to me.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman and the other gentleman who came to me about the bill were told then that I did not intend to vote for the bill. That did not make any impression upon them, apparently, although the advice of how to do it did apparently make an impression. I do not consider that I am under obligation to give information to a gentleman about a parliamentary situation when he asks me, whether I am for his proposition or against it, and I hope that gentlemen will not consider when they ask as to what can be done in a particular parliamentary situation and I tell them what my views are as to what can be done, that thereby I am obligated to support their propositions, because if that be the case, I shall be as close as a clam hereafter.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. I want to ask three or four questions of somebody. I tried to ask it of the chairman of the committee quietly, but I did not get much satisfaction. I would like to know, first, what the population of Wilmington, N. C., is? I would like to know, next, what the receipts of the post office are, and I would like, again, to know the customs receipts of that office?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I will give the gentleman 66½ per cent of the information that he desires. The balance I have not got. The population in 1910 was 25,748. The gross postal receipts in 1913 were \$135,193.76; money-order receipts in 1913, \$236,062.66; postal-savings receipts in 1913, \$3,133. The building is for a customhouse and appraisal stores and other governmental offices exclusive of the post office.

Mr. DONOVAN. And the gentleman does not know what the customs receipts are?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not?

Mr. DONOVAN. Is that a very intelligent handling of the subject—not to know what the customs receipts are?

Mr. FITZGERALD. What difference does it make what the customs receipts are?

Mr. DONOVAN. I will tell what is necessary to know. I am going to tell what I think about it in my own way and in my own style.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It does not make any difference what the gentleman thinks about it. What the gentleman thinks about it and whether it is an intelligent handling of the subject are two entirely different things.

Mr. DONOVAN. Let us see, Mr. Chairman. A great man, a great committee, and the chairman of the same, engineered a bill through this House carrying \$600,000 authorization for Wilmington, N. C., a locality of less than 30,000 souls. What do you think about that? [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. The trouble with the gentleman is that he is incorrect.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman should conduct himself in an orderly way. You should first get recognition from the Chair before interrupting me.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. DONOVAN. Not at this moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. This is the proposition. I am obliged to repeat it lest my audience forgets the point I am trying to make. A great committee, a most important committee, and a great chairman in the Sixty-second Congress engineered a bill through this establishment known as the House of Representatives for \$600,000 for a public building in a locality having less than 30,000 souls.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the chairman in this Congress very kindly told us awhile ago that a \$75,000 proposition in every locality, with the same number in population such as the gentleman from California had offered, would bankrupt this great country. I can not understand why the people of my State have been shanghaied all these years. [Laughter.] We have a customhouse and we have a post office in a locality of 110,000 souls. The receipts of the customhouse are half a million dollars. The receipts of the post office are over \$400,000. What happened to our little State when my predecessor, the greatest man this Congress ever had as a Member, when he, who was the greatest man in his own opinion who ever came out in the world, who was here for 18 years, and the only Federal building

in his district with a roof or chimney on it cost a little over \$250,000? What is it that they do to us from the Nutmeg State when they get our great men down here? Do they do as they do in other localities, pull them into a dark alley masked and strip them and take to themselves \$600,000 for towns of 30,000 population?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say the Committee on Appropriations did not put through the House the bill authorizing this building. There might be something accurate about the balance of the gentleman's statement, but there is no accuracy—

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOVAN. We have just listened to the gentleman from Alabama, we have listened to the minority leader, as well as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and all hands of it in the steal. [Laughter.] Well, all acquiesced in it and no protest was made, but they have given the minority leader a \$50,000 proposition in the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I decline to yield further.

Mr. MANN. The statement the gentleman makes, like most of his statements, is absolutely without any foundation of fact.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Connecticut can not even repeat a statement made within five minutes here on this floor. I have stated here, I think, a dozen times to-day I opposed the passage of the public-buildings bill. If the gentleman were in his place, and attentive and alert as he pretends sometimes to be about what is transpiring in this House, he would not make so many absurd statements in one five minutes. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Wytheville, Va., post office: For completion, \$25,000.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, in pursuance of the unanimous-consent agreement, I now offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after line 2, on page 2, down to and including line 6, on page 22, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Albany, Oreg., post office: For completion, \$10,000.
 "Amarillo, Tex., post office and courthouse: For completion, \$133,000.
 "Arkansas City, Kans., post office: For completion, \$35,000.
 "Augusta, Ga., post office and courthouse (new): For completion, \$50,000.
 "Bainbridge, Ga., post office: For completion, \$15,000.
 "Bangor, Me., post office: For completion, \$40,000.
 "Bedford, Pa., post office: For completion, \$50,000.
 "Berkeley, Cal., post office: For completion, \$20,000.
 "Cadillac, Mich., post office: For completion, \$43,000.
 "Camden, S. C., post office: For completion, \$6,500.
 "Carnegie, Pa., post office: For completion, \$35,000.
 "Cartersville, Ga., post office: For completion, \$5,000.
 "Chico, Cal., post office: For completion, \$35,000.
 "Collinsville, Ill., post office: For completion, \$36,000.
 "Delevan, Wis., post office: For completion, \$10,000.
 "Denver, Colo., post office: For completion, \$200,000.
 "De Soto, Mo., post office: For completion, \$5,000.
 "Excelsior Springs, Mo., post office: For completion, \$20,000.
 "Fulton, Ky., post office: For completion, \$35,000.
 "Garden City, Kans., post office: For completion, \$45,000.
 "Gastonia, N. C., post office: For completion, \$15,000.
 "Georgetown, Ky., post office: For completion, \$45,000.
 "Grass Valley, Cal., post office: For completion, \$10,000.
 "Greeley, Colo., post office: For completion, \$25,000.
 "Grenada, Miss., post office: For completion, \$25,000.
 "Hampton, Va., post office: For completion, \$20,000.
 "Hanford, Cal., post office: For completion, \$15,000.
 "Harrisburg, Pa., post office and courthouse: For completion, \$75,000.
 "Hilo, Hawaii, post office, customhouse, and courthouse: For completion, \$50,000.
 "Holland, Mich., post office: For completion, \$55,000.
 "Huntingdon, Pa., post office: For completion, \$15,000.
 "Jackson, Ky., post office and courthouse: For completion, \$35,000.
 "Jellico, Tenn., post office: For completion, \$30,000.
 "Jennings, La., post office: For completion, \$25,000.
 "La Fayette, La., post office: For completion, \$10,000.
 "Lake City, Minn., post office: For completion, \$29,000.
 "Lynchburg, Va., post office and courthouse: For completion, \$25,000.
 "McPherson, Kans., post office: For completion, \$20,000.
 "Milwaukee, Wis., appraisers' stores: For completion, \$40,000.
 "Minot, N. Dak., post office and courthouse: For completion, \$20,000.
 "Mobile, Ala., post office: For completion, \$70,000.
 "Moundsville, W. Va., post office: For completion, \$10,000.
 "Mount Vernon, Ill., post office: For completion, \$8,000.
 "Narragansett Pier, R. I., post office: For completion, \$39,000.
 "New Haven, Conn., post office: For completion, \$400,000.
 "New Rochelle, N. Y., post office: For completion, \$15,000.
 "Orange, N. J., post office: For completion, \$20,000.
 "Osage City, Kans., post office: For completion, \$12,000.
 "Pensacola, Fla., post office and courthouse: For completion, \$30,000.
 "Port Jervis, N. Y., post office: For completion, \$10,000.
 "Princeton, Ill., post office: For completion, \$50,000.
 "Rocky Mount, N. C., post office: For completion, \$30,000.
 "Shelbyville, Tenn., post office: For completion, \$5,000.
 "Sycamore, Ill., post office: For completion, \$15,000.
 "Tarboro, N. C., post office: For completion, \$25,000.
 "Three Rivers, Mich., post office: For completion, \$10,000.
 "Tupelo, Miss., post office: For completion, \$40,000.
 "Urbana, Ill., post office: For completion, \$10,000."

"Williston, N. Dak., post office: For completion, \$5,000.
 "Winchester, Tenn., post office: For completion, \$15,000.
 "Winfield, Kans., post office: For completion, \$44,000.
 "Wytheville, Va., post office: For completion, \$25,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to see if we can arrange time for debate upon this amendment.

Mr. GILLET. What does the gentleman suggest?

Mr. FITZGERALD. If nobody wants any time, I would suggest 10 minutes.

Mr. GILLET. I want five minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I suppose a number of the Members—

Mr. MANN. Suppose we start for awhile without limitation and then see.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think the time should be divided between those in favor of the motion and those opposed to it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am trying to see if we can arrange time for debate. I think it would be much more satisfactory to do that. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 80 minutes, 40 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts and 40 minutes by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asks unanimous consent that all debate upon the pending amendment and all amendments thereto be concluded in 80 minutes, 40 minutes of the time to be controlled by himself and the remaining 40 minutes by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET]. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if the apportionment of time is for the purpose of lengthening the discussion on this bill, it seems to me that method will have that effect. If there are any who in seriousness expect to support the motion, except the gentleman from Massachusetts who offers it, they are not now manifest, and it seems to me if we are proceeding under the rules of debate and exchange time first to one for the amendment and then to one who is opposed to it we will get through with a good deal less than 80 minutes, in my judgment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If objection is made at the end of 80 minutes, I will move to close debate, anyway.

Mr. MARTIN. I am not objecting; but I suggest it seems to me on a proposition of this kind we are simply lengthening the consideration of the bill unnecessarily.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, my proposition is to strike out all the appropriations for public buildings now in the bill, and insert in lieu thereof the list of buildings which the Treasury Department has stated have been commenced or are now under contract. In other words it leaves out every building where no work has been done or where no contract obligation has been incurred.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLET. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. I followed the reading of the amendment as best I could, and I noticed a great many items in the bill marked for completion which are not included—

Mr. GILLET. Those are for extensions which have not been commenced, and an appropriation will complete them.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. GILLET. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. I want to ask the gentleman if work has not begun on extensions if that should be included—

Mr. GILLET. No; that would go out if the work had not been begun.

Now, the appropriations for public buildings in this bill amount to \$11,984,920. My proposed amendment makes appropriations for \$2,300,500. Consequently, if it should be adopted, it would save the Treasury \$9,684,420, quite a comfortable sum in the present condition of the Treasury.

I offer this amendment, not as carrying out any opinions I may have as to the advisability of these public buildings—although I have decided opinions upon it—but on the ground that the Treasury is nearly empty, that according to our best advices as to income next year it is not likely to be replenished, and that now is a time when we should exercise strict economy, and should not appropriate for luxuries, but only for necessities. And it seems to me if anything is a luxury and not a necessity it is the new public buildings which this bill carries.

The other day I was reading a history of the English Parliament, and I came across this sentence, which, I think, is very appropriate to the American Congress. It ran:

If you want to raise a certain cheer in the House of Commons, make a general panegyric on economy. If you want to invite a sure defeat, propose a particular saving.

And, I confess, in the light of that statement—which, I think, applies to us quite as much as to them—my hope that this amendment will be adopted is not strong. The other side of the House have always been advocates of economy in theory, although I will do them the justice to admit that for the last few months I have heard no such boasts on that side. They have not recently had the assurance to pretend that they have been economical. But the leader of that side, Mr. UNDERWOOD, just the other day insisted in the House that there was great need of retrenchment. Now, here is an opportunity, not for a general panegyric on economy but to vote on a particular instance, an instance that will save the Treasury over \$9,000,000. And there is not a building in this whole list, I think you will all admit, which can not be deferred without any interference with the functions of the Government.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLET. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. How many items does the gentleman's amendment contemplate?

Mr. GILLET. I do not know the number.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Does it not reduce the number something like 150?

Mr. GILLET. I have not any idea of the number. The figures of dollars and not of particular instances are all I have.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. If it does reduce the number that much, that will defeat the amendment.

Mr. GILLET. I appreciate the force of the gentleman's argument that there would be 150 sure votes against it, but I thought there was only one line to follow, and that was to cut out everything which has not now been begun. Therefore I asked the Treasury Department to give me a statement of all those cases, so that there should be no favoritism.

In this bill there are many items, like Jasper, Ala.—and I will only suggest one—where there is an authorization of \$107,500 for a town with a population of 2,500 people. At present they are paying there for rent, light, heat, and janitor \$372 a year. Yet there is an authorization of over \$100,000. Heating, lighting, and janitor service would cost many times more than they are now paying for rent. I will not now discuss the propriety of that building, although I have a very decided opinion about it; but it seems to me that everybody who professes the slightest desire to make the balance of expenditures and revenues meet, who desire that in the next fiscal year we shall not have a great deficit, or who wants to reduce the deficit which there is certain to be, ought to say, "Here is an appropriation which the country can go without for another year as well as not," and vote for this amendment. The Government service will not suffer in the slightest, and the Government Treasury will be materially helped.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSTER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT].

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I never heard this howl for economy from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] when his party was manipulating the exchequer. I never heard much of it from the gentleman when he himself had an item upon the last public building bill, one of the smallest in the whole list. He was suddenly spurred and awakened, and made some kind of objection to the bill, and when taunted with the fact that he himself had an item on it his excuse was that others were getting in. Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman the other day had the chance to vote for one battleship instead of two, when we were trying to cut off \$15,000,000. He did not do it, but I believe admitted that for the first time he voted for two instead of one. Was he for economy then? His plea here to-day is to cut off \$9,000,000 which is going almost entirely to the interior and the smaller towns of the country, at least the greater part of it. That is about all that the people of the interior districts ever see of what goes with the taxes that they pay.

Last year we passed a good-roads bill providing for \$25,000,000 for good roads.

Mr. BORLAND rose.

Mr. BURNETT. I decline to yield. I have only five minutes. Did the gentleman vote for the people then? The Record will show; but I do not think I ever heard his voice or the voices of these gentlemen from the great cities, who are voting to curtail this expenditure, raised in favor of the people in the country who want good roads. We tried the other day to strike from the naval appropriation one great battleship costing \$15,000,000, at a time when it seems to me that that appropriation is less excusable than ever, when the great nations of the world, the only ones that might at any time be a menace to us, are involved in a titanic conflict that will deplete their treasuries

and decimate their armies, and for the next 50 or 100 years make our country more immune than ever from any attacks from outside enemies, why did not he and these other gentlemen who cry "economy" vote to save the Treasury? These gentlemen who are here wanting to cut down appropriations which we wish to make in order that the people in the small cities may see something of where their money goes, never raised their voices or cast their votes in order to cut off those expenditures that might easily have been dispensed with. Yet, now, in order to make a political cry of economy and in order to try to anathematize the Democratic Party for extravagance they come up here and attempt to make this cut on items that I think are just. Two years ago Congress, by an overwhelming vote, said that the items that were on the bill reported to the House by the committee, of which I was the acting chairman, ought to be authorized. The Appropriations Committee has come—in compliance with the mandate of the law that was then passed with only 25 or 30 dissenting votes, and bills passed in 1910 and 1908, and in compliance with the law which authorized these appropriations—has come in and said, "We propose now to comply with the directions that Congress gave us, regardless of whether we voted for the bills or not, by making a recommendation of appropriations to carry out the will almost unanimously expressed by Congress two years and four years ago."

And yet, in order to make cheap political capital, gentlemen who vote for other gross extravagances come now, when, as I say, there is the least excuse for it, and say to us who live in the interior section of the country, "We will cut you down, but we will not cut down the navy yards and the immense battle-ships." It shows an inconsistency in men who are prone to make these fallacious arguments on the floor of the House for the purpose of getting cheap notoriety and in order to undertake to assault the party they have been fighting so long. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] referred to Jasper, Ala., an appropriation, as I recollect, of \$1,000 for beginning work. The gentleman from Massachusetts was not fair enough to state it, but there is not only a post office there, but there is a Federal court there, and certainly the amount that is authorized for the construction of a post office and a Federal courthouse would not be considered as excessive. Yet, without information or knowledge in regard to it, the gentleman makes a fling at it. It is not in my district; I have not a single item on this bill; but I am speaking for the men that are represented in the bill and who sustained our hands two and four years ago. [Applause.]

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I did not know that Jasper included both a courthouse and a post office. It is not my fault, because on looking up the record it did not show that it was for anything except the post office. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I shall oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I shall be very frank in stating my reasons for so doing. The first item under the public-buildings section of this appropriation bill reads:

Aberdeen, Wash., post office: For commencement, \$1,000.

Almost the last item in the section reads:

Vancouver, Wash., post office: For commencement, \$10,000.

Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly the condition of the country calls for rigid economy in the expenditures of public money. It is strange that we have waited until the last appropriation bill is under consideration and then propose to start in by cutting the initial appropriations for post-office buildings that were authorized years ago.

If it is desired that it is necessary to economize in the expenses of the Government of the United States to the extent of further delaying work on authorized public buildings, then the motion which should be offered should be a motion to strike out all of these items, including those which give money to buildings in the slow progress of construction. There can be no more reason why there should be further delay in starting \$1,000 worth of survey and foundation work in Aberdeen, where a building has been promised and authorized, than there is in appropriating for further construction of a post office in Alliance, Ohio, or any city or town mentioned in the bill. Even under favorable circumstances suspension of work occurs time and time again, and as long as the amendment does not propose to strike out and postpone all of the construction work, I shall oppose this amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. Let us all be treated alike. Suspend public buildings entirely for a year, or let the smaller places have their start along with other places which are given sums with which to carry on the slow

work of building. Further, the situation is very much as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] has just said—the little cities which have been promised these offices by act of Congress are entitled to them just as much as the great cities, and very often a modest public building is the limit of their Government requests and about all that they get out of the millions appropriated yearly by Congress. The cry for economy has started in the wrong place and a little too late.

In this bill it is proposed to start four buildings in the great State of Washington—one at Aberdeen, \$1,000; one at Vancouver, \$10,000; one at Wenatchee, \$1,000; and one at Ellensburg, \$10,000; in all, \$22,000. Certainly a modest sum, inasmuch as each one of these cities has a building authorized. Each city has been on the waiting list for three years or so. They have reached a place in the Treasury Department's list so that they come within the 150 buildings ready to be started. Two—Vancouver and Ellensburg—are ready for the initial contracts, being that much further advanced than Aberdeen and Wenatchee, and the two last named are clearly entitled to keep their places on the list and receive the starting appropriations.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, which, in effect, strikes from the bill all appropriations for buildings not yet commenced. It would strike from the bill the appropriation of \$300,000 for the immigration station provided for the city of Baltimore.

It is useless for me to say how badly we need these buildings. I have spoken before the House on several occasions and have said that we now have practically no Government provision whatever for the Immigration Service at our city, but this appropriation will begin the work, which will be second to none in construction and usefulness in this country. Baltimore does not ask that the Government do things alone; she cooperates and does those things she can for herself.

It is a coincidence that 11 years ago this afternoon the great fire which swept the business section of Baltimore began. It spread over an area of some 140 acres and swept from our midst property estimated to be worth \$125,000,000, and from which only \$32,000,000 was recovered in insurance. The balance was a loss to our people; yet Baltimore arose phoenix-like from this great calamity, and while she had at the time of the fire an assessable tax basis of \$439,000,000, in 1910 this had increased to \$682,000,000, and to-day we have a \$828,000,000 taxable basis. Not only did we recover in that time from the great conflagration and build up our city more magnificently than ever, but you will observe we have almost doubled the taxable basis in those 11 years.

Baltimore has expended millions of dollars upon its docks and wharves and in dredging its splendid harbor. Sixty-five millions of dollars have been voted to be expended in public improvements, and the city shows the results of this expenditure. Miles of smooth streets have been laid, and to-day she is one of the best-paved cities in the country. A sewerage system costing \$23,000,000 has been constructed, and is the best in the world. The Key Highway, named after the author of the Star-Spangled Banner, has been largely constructed, leading from the center of the city, connecting with all the business sections, the railroads, and wharves, and reaching the site where the proposed immigration station is to be erected. This will give easy access from the railroads and steamship lines to the new immigration station for which this appropriation is intended. It will open to all railroads and steamship lines which come to Baltimore this new immigration, whereas now this business is controlled by one steamship line and one railroad.

I wish to call the committee's attention also to the admirable location of Baltimore from a commercial standpoint. It is pretty generally known that Baltimore is closer to the Middle West than any of the other Atlantic seaports. I think it will be a surprise, however, to the committee to know that she is closer to the Great Lakes, to wit, to Buffalo, by 16 miles than New York City itself. It will likewise be a greater surprise to learn how magnificently she is located as to the trade which we hope to receive through the Panama Canal from the western coast of South America. I take as a comparison the city of San Francisco, as that seems to be in the general mind, especially in view of the fact that San Francisco is now receiving such abundant advertising because of the great exposition about to be opened in that city. I therefore would remind you that Baltimore is 1,369 miles closer than San Francisco to the Panama Canal. It is 470 miles closer than San Francisco to the city of Valparaiso, Chile, which latter city is the chief seaport on the western side of South America. It is only 1,908 miles by water route from Baltimore to the eastern entrance of

the Panama Canal, while it is 3,277 miles from San Francisco to the western entrance.

After computing the 50 miles which is the length of the canal from Colon to Panama, it is only 4,670 miles from Baltimore to Valparaiso, while it is 5,140 miles from San Francisco to the same place. Baltimore is also closer than any of the big Atlantic seaports to the South American cities on the east coast.

This amendment would, as I have said, strike down the appropriation for the building of that immigration station, which is most important to the handling of immigration at this port. For these and many other reasons I am opposed to its adoption. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to insert an editorial from the Baltimore Evening Sun of January 30, 1915, entitled "The city of Baltimore," which gives at length the great importance of our city.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing the article referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The following is the article:

THE CITY OF BALTIMORE.

Unfortunately it is necessary to remind the people of Baltimore from time to time that they, like Paul of Tarsus, are citizens of no mean city. We say it is unfortunately necessary to make this reminder because the vast majority of them do not realize the majesty and greatness of the town in which they live.

The great fire 11 years ago this coming February destroyed 1,343 buildings, which with their contents were valued as high as \$125,000,000. The desolated area was 140 acres—as large as a farm. Only \$32,000,000 was recovered in insurance—the remainder was loss. No people ever met disaster with a finer spirit. Aid was offered from every quarter, but all was declined. The legislature of the State appropriated \$250,000 as an emergency fund, but only \$24,000 was used. The people of the city met the situation single handed and turned misfortune to advantage. Since that great fire, from which many thought the city would never recover, Baltimore has steadily advanced in all material welfare. The people voted \$65,000,000 for public improvements, and the result is manifest to-day.

Baltimore is now one of the best-paved cities of the whole land. It has a sewerage system which cost \$23,000,000 and which is the best in the world. It has taken electric wires and poles from the streets and put them underground. It has acquired and now owns a splendid water front. The construction of a highway through the heart of the city, covering Jones's Falls, which has been an open sewer, was a triumph of engineering and of enduring value.

Baltimore has been called "slow" and without the spirit of manufacturing enterprise. And yet her factories put out a product worth a million dollars every workday of the year. The wages paid for labor amount to something like a million dollars every Saturday evening. Baltimore has a record of enterprise second to that of no other city. It has been a pioneer among cities. From our wharves 144 years ago the first cargo of grain that went from the New World to the Old sailed down the Patapsco. The year before the Declaration of Independence was signed Baltimore fitted out the first two vessels for an American Navy, and that same year the first frigate of the Navy was built at Fells Point. In 1792 the first water company in the United States was organized here and gave Baltimore the first waterworks in America. Here steel pens were first made and, in 1816, the first gas company of the country was organized. The first steam railroad chartered in the New World was in Baltimore—the Baltimore & Ohio—and later on the first electric road ever built in the world was built here. From Baltimore sailed the first steam vessel that ever crossed the Atlantic.

No mechanical device has done more for the spread of knowledge, for popular government, and popular education than the rotary press, and it was the Baltimore Sun that first employed this great engine of civilization, and nine years before that it had been the first newspaper in the world to employ the electric telegraph in gathering news—and it was Baltimore to which the first telegraph wire was stretched and to which the first message was sent.

People who call Baltimore slow have never read history and do not keep up with the times. Baltimore has been the most enterprising city in America, and the spirit of enterprise is still alive in this beautiful town.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT].

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this amendment in the interest of economy in spite of the fact that it affects my district and my home town to the extent of \$40,000. The city of Poughkeepsie, N. Y., has an unusual post-office building, erected in 1886, during the term of my illustrious predecessor, Gen. Ketcham, and so well located that the building and grounds are probably worth twice as much now as when the building was constructed. The receipts of the office are something like one hundred and twenty-five or one hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars a year, and since the parcel post has been inaugurated, and even before that time, the office has been pretty badly crowded. Several years ago it became necessary to place the money-order and registry departments on the second floor, which is very inconvenient. But I am not altogether sure that it would make a real delay of any great account to cut an item like this out of this bill. There has been a previous appropriation to start the work, but I think none of it has actually been started or placed under contract, and everyone knows that the Supervising Architect's Office is so badly crowded with work, that if we give them a chance to finish up what they have got we probably will not lose anything by letting these items for extension work, where no work has

actually been done, be postponed for the time being. In all probability when they get the work they are now engaged in done and take this work up again they will be just as far along and we will get the work done just as quickly as if it all went into the bill now.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York yields back two minutes.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS].

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rather regret that the gentleman who has proposed this amendment did not see fit to leave in one item that I see on page 16 of the bill, because that one happens to be up in my district. I happen to know that at Ridgway, Pa., they are very much in need of quarters of some kind for their post office, and I find by personal inspection that at times they are obliged to use the back alley as a storage ground because of insufficiency of quarters. Yet at the same time it seems to me that at a time when we are stared in the face by the conviction that the money that is appropriated in this bill will have to be provided by additional taxation we should be very careful about making expenditures that might very well be postponed. I have been appalled at the size of some of these appropriations for little one-horse towns all over the country. Some of them have been referred to. For seven years I have served on the State armory board of the State of Pennsylvania and have been engaged in building armories all over that State. Our limit of expenditure has been from twenty-five to thirty thousand dollars for both construction and site. It is true that in most cases the people of the communities furnish the site, but the cost of construction of these buildings is limited to twenty-five or thirty thousand dollars, and they are large buildings, well and substantially built, always at least 60 feet front and 110 to 140 feet in depth, and are constructed of brick or stone. It seems to me that an expenditure of that amount ought to be sufficient for any post office in any of these towns of ten or fifteen thousand population anywhere in the country.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this amendment, with the thought that additional time and consideration will enable the committee at another time to bring in a bill which is not so grossly extravagant and improvident as this bill is in many particulars.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back half a minute.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] who makes this motion makes it upon the alleged ground of economy. I do not desire to call into question his sincerity, but it is very apparent that it is on a very small scale that he proposes to economize when, if he had desired it, he had an opportunity to economize on a large scale. Economy does not consist always in the failure to expend money. The best economy sometimes consists in the wise, just, and legitimate expenditure of public funds. The gentleman from Massachusetts and the other gentlemen who have followed him in this debate have been unfortunate in one thing. They give no just reason for the economy they are asking for. They concede that they are without knowledge as to the merits of the particular projects they propose to reject and have thrown from this bill. The gentleman does not present himself in a very enviable light when he makes a wholesale motion proposing to strike various items from the bill and concedes his ignorance as to the facts of each and every item that he would strike from the bill. I am going to take up one instance only as an illustration to show this House how unwise the proposition is, and I take it that the other instances are very much like it. He desired to strike \$30,000 from the bill for the alleged extension of the customhouse at Chattanooga, Tenn. For want of sufficient appropriation heretofore that building was never entirely completed. It is a three-story building, and three parts of it have been completed and the fourth has been completed only a part of the way. The new space desired is absolutely essential to carry on the public business. The clerks in the post-office part of the building are so close together in their work that when they come to handle the bags of mail they touch elbows. We need nearly twice the space that we have. The court officials are crowded for space. When you put the other two stories on the building as proposed, it will still be necessary in order to carry on the public business in decency and in order to rent some adjoining building for the purpose of storage. Chattanooga has about 100,000 population. The gross postal receipts are over \$495,000 per annum. It would be very unwise not to make the customhouse improvement in this case in the public interest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, even those who desire to economize in the construction of public buildings should not vote for the motion made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, because the effect of that motion will be to paralyze the public-building business and the Supervising Architect's Office. If we desire to economize in the public buildings, the way to do it is to adopt the suggestion of the Supervising Architect's Office to take the sums in the Treasury heretofore appropriated for public buildings and make them available for any construction that can be reached in regular order the coming fiscal year. In that way the Supervising Architect's Office will keep working steadily and with full force and no new sum need be appropriated. The Supervising Architect's Office expends ordinarily \$12,000,000 a year. There must be about that much expended in order to keep the force at work. That means, among other things, the preparation of plans and the letting of contracts for about 70 buildings annually. If this amendment is adopted, as Mr. Wenderoth told the committee in answer to my questions, it will entirely take away from their office the work that they are prepared to do the coming fiscal year. I asked Mr. Wenderoth this question:

Mr. MONDELL. These estimates of \$1,000 which you make for the purpose of enabling you to make the survey and examinations preliminary to the preparations of plans, if those items were not provided for you could not go on with the preparation of the plans for those buildings?

Mr. WENDEROTH. No, sir. It would virtually wind up the office in the fiscal year 1917.

There is considerable more of that, but I have not time to go into it in detail.

Later there was the following said in the hearings:

Mr. MONDELL. The small items are necessary to enable you to do anything beyond the acquisition of the sites?

Mr. WENDEROTH. Yes, sir. For the new projects that are reached so near the end of the 16-month period we only need the \$1,000 for the survey, etc. If we do not obtain at least that amount in each case we will have nothing to work on during the fiscal year 1917.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. HULINGS. Is it not true that the architect's office is about four years behind time now?

Mr. MONDELL. But it does not help them to catch up by stopping all work on new buildings. The entire force in the architect's office can not be advantageously used on the contracts already let. If we are to expedite the work, we must make appropriations necessary for the examinations that precede the preparation of plans. If we suspend work on the plans for new buildings, we will further delay, we will further check, the development of the public-buildings program. If gentlemen really want to economize, the way to do it is to give the Supervising Architect an opportunity to use the funds that he already has and give him \$2,000,000 additional if he desires it, and allow him to go on in an orderly way; but the program presented by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] will disorganize the work of the office and prevent them from carrying it on in an orderly way, and place them in a position where they will have nothing to work on the fiscal year 1917.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I did not understand fully the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] as to the basis on which buildings are included in his amendment on the one hand and excluded on the other. There is one item in the bill I did not hear read as part of the amendment of the gentleman, pertaining to Cookeville, Tenn., post office and courthouse, for completion, \$40,000. The facts in this case are that Congress has already appropriated \$60,000, and this remainder is necessary to complete the construction of the courthouse building, which is urgently needed. The construction of the building has already been let some weeks ago. I am not sure whether the work is commenced or not. I do not know how the gentleman from Massachusetts, or even the Treasury Department, would know as to that. However, that is one of the cases presented here which the amendment, if I construe it correctly, would exclude from this bill. I heard several items embraced in the amendment of the gentleman for the completion of post-office buildings in cities and towns of different sizes, cases where there were certainly not as much urgency as the present case, where the Federal court is really postponed at times for lack of an adequate building in which to hold it and to keep the records, and so forth. It seems to me that where the Government has let a contract for the construction of a building, a courthouse building, urgently needed, as I say, and

the department has notified the people interested and notified the contractors that the work shall proceed, that it would result in much confusion on account of the delay by striking out the appropriation and abandoning the premises and the project which has already been carried out to the extent I have stated. I think in cases of urgent need, where the contract has already been let, the items should stand. I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman used three minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts to use some time.

Mr. GILLET. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, this proposition means that the Government of the United States will not encourage the building business or the employment of idle mechanics throughout the United States. I believe it is a mistaken idea of the National Government in times of distress and idleness to economize and delay and postpone building operations which would put into circulation money, and at the same time give employment to thousands of American workmen who are walking the streets of the industrial cities seeking employment—many almost starving. Let the Government, if it desires to delay business or building operations, do it in a prosperous period of the country's history, when private corporations, private firms, and municipalities can furnish employment for every mechanic in the land. There are no less than 5,000,000 deserving American citizens out of employment to-day.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman is wrong about that.

Mr. AUSTIN. There are over 500,000 in New York alone.

Mr. BORLAND. There are not 5,000,000 of American citizens out of employment to-day, and I challenge the gentleman to produce any reliable figures to prove it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, a year ago I read to the House a statement from a New York daily giving a list of 331,000 idle mechanics in that city.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I will yield later on. Judge Gary, chairman of the executive committee of the unemployed in New York City, says the number out of employment in that city is 200,000 more than at this time last year. In one American city alone there are more than half a million workmen out of employment, and if the gentleman will take Boston, Kansas City, and Pittsburgh, and every city, village, and hamlet in this land, the number of idle people will exceed 5,000,000.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I will.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Did the gentleman see a statement in the paper a few days ago which said that the city of New York wanted to get men to shovel snow off the streets and they could not secure a sufficient number to do it?

Mr. AUSTIN. There are 10,000 in the bread line alone in that city, and they have to use the recreation piers in order to furnish idle people a place to sleep.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. NORTON. I have a paper that I hold in my hand here which says there are more men out of work than ever, reported from New York.

Mr. AUSTIN. A man who will state that there are not thousands and millions of men out of employment is mistaken; he is simply blinded to facts that exist in the district of every man who has a seat on the floor of this House.

I think the National Government ought not only to do this work but it ought to pass a good-roads bill and put millions in circulation and employ the countless thousands of idle men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

A MEMBER. Where are we going to get the money?

Mr. AUSTIN. Get it from selling Panama bonds.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment, perhaps, because it involves some work to be done in some of the cities of my district, and on that account I speak from personal knowledge. From the very hour this bill was passed negotiations have been pending for the purchase of land that have not been concluded, and any further delay in closing them up would add to the amount of expense, I firmly believe, of the Federal Government. I can say, as some other gentlemen have said in regard to conditions existing in the post-office building, the one in the city of the district which I speak of is congested, and work is carried on at great inconvenience and in a manner that ought no longer be tolerated.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no further debate, the Chair will put the question.

Mr. GILLETT. I think the other side ought to use some time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN].

Mr. DONOVAN. I should like five minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield four minutes.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I am entitled to five minutes. What are you going to do with it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am going to give the gentleman four minutes. If he does not take that I will give him nothing.

Mr. DONOVAN. And from that decision there is no appeal; is that it?

Mr. MOON. I believe I have two minutes left—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair begs to state that the gentleman can not yield that.

Mr. DONOVAN. Am I going to have my five minutes?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I can not give the gentleman five minutes. There are more gentlemen who wish to speak.

Mr. DONOVAN. Never mind; never mind. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] explain in a moment, without using up all of my time, by what sort of reasoning he can come in here with an amendment to eliminate the carrying out of an obligation on the part of the United States, when a contract has been let for the construction of a building?

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman is mistaken. No such cases are carried in the amendment.

Mr. DONOVAN. Has not the gentleman eliminated Danbury, Conn.?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not know. I asked the Treasury Department to give me a list of all the places where no work had been begun.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman has answered me, and I decline to yield further. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] did not know what he was doing when he offered the amendment. That is all there is to it. He has been a Member here for many years, and he does not know what he has been doing. This is the fact: The gentleman has by his amendment endeavored to strike out public buildings for which contracts have been entered into and obligations created, and he would repudiate them. Now, that is the Massachusetts way of doing things—without knowledge. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, there has been only one public building in my district, a locality settled over 200 years ago. I stated a while ago that the cost of the building was \$250,000. That was the cost of the public building in a place of 110,000 population. I find you have passed an appropriation of \$600,000 for Wilmington, N. C., which has less than 30,000 population. I find, too, that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the minority leader, had in the same bill an appropriation for his district of \$50,000 passed on February 17, 1913. Now, during the discussion of that bill, from the first presentation by the Clerk until the final vote, there was not the slightest objection on the part of Mr. MANN, the minority leader, to that bill giving \$600,000 to Wilmington, N. C., on the pretense that it was a building for public purposes. I believe the customs receipts of Wilmington, N. C., are less than \$20,000 a year. In my district the customs receipts in a \$250,000 building are half a million a year and the postal receipts \$400,000 a year, while the postal receipts of Wilmington, N. C., are \$135,000 a year. But this great minority leader, with a \$50,000 appropriation in the bill, by some sort of process remained silent to that way of doing business. For verification you will find it in the proceedings of the House on February 17, 1913. Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] may think it is a proper way to do business to abrogate contracts advertised by the Government, duly let and signed, and he comes in here and wants to repudiate them. Is that the way you do in Springfield, Mass.? Is not that a fine proposition to offer and to advocate in this body, where there should be fair play, where there should be some honor?

I yield back the balance of my time under the circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used his time.

Mr. GILLETT. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, of course this amendment is not at all likely to pass, for there are 270 items in the bill and the amendment strikes out 207 of them. We are not going to vote on this amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] on the theory of economy. We are going to vote on this amendment on the theory of self-interest, I regret to say. If there ever was a time when this House should adopt an amendment of this sort, now is the time. The Treasury will be short something like \$80,000,000 at the end of this fiscal year if I can read aright. There will be a deficit to that extent.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. Does the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman does not want any information, I take it.

Mr. MADDEN. By this amendment we will save \$9,000,000 to the Treasury. The items to be stricken from the bill by the gentleman's amendment are items that can not be used in any district between now and the beginning of the next fiscal year. Most of them are to begin buildings. Many of them carry only \$1,000, said to be for surveys and borings. Nonsense! Of course the Appropriations Committee are bound by the directions given to them through the law enacted in 1913 to report these appropriations. They are not to blame because they have done so.

Mr. BURNETT. Will the gentleman yield one moment for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. I can not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BURNETT. They were authorized in 1910 mainly.

Mr. MADDEN. It would hurt no one to delay it for the time being. It would prevent additional taxation on the already overburdened American people, many of whom are out of employment. The enactment of the bill with all the items in it would not add to the employment of the men of the country, because the Supervising Architect in charge of the construction of public buildings says himself that all he wants is to maintain his force in his office. Well, are we going to impose additional taxation on the already overtaxed, idle people of America, in order that the Supervising Architect of the Treasury may keep 5 or 6 or a dozen or 15 draftsmen at work? I apprehend not. Gentlemen, if you are really in favor of the economy that you preach, here is an opportunity to practice it. Quit going to the people in your campaigns and saying that you are to be the advance guard of economy if you are charged with power. Now is the time to prove your patriotism. We are in a period of distress. We have no new sources of revenue. The President of the United States will be here again shortly, asking for a new law to create new taxes, still further to burden the people who are out of employment. Vote to save this \$9,000,000!

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, whether this amendment is taken seriously or not by the members of this committee, it ought to be. It has been drawn, as I understand, after consultation with the Treasury Department, and it indicates in a fairly accurate way the buildings which are not imperatively needed for the transaction of the public business and which can be omitted or postponed at this time.

The Appropriations Committee included these items because they had in their turn been recommended by the Supervising Architect. That committee is not charged with legislation, it can not repeal any of the authorizations for public buildings, neither did it create the authorizations for public buildings. But it leaves the matter to the judgment of this House, as it ought, whether at this time in comparison with other necessary demands on the Public Treasury new buildings ought to be begun.

There seems fortunately to be no partisanship on this question. Gentlemen are opposed to the proposition on both sides of the House, and some gentlemen on both sides of the House are advocating the passage of the amendment. There is no necessity at the present time for the beginning of new work on public buildings except to a limited extent, to which exception is made in the amendment proposed. If gentlemen want to divorce themselves from any special interest they may have in these appropriations and consider this matter as a board of directors of a business concern would consider it in view of the probable receipts and necessity of expenditures, whether they want to authorize these expenditures to the possible exclusion of other necessary expenditures, they will vote for this amendment. There are many other demands made by the American people on the American Congress much more imperative than the construction of the buildings eliminated by this amendment.

Take any one of these projects that gentlemen think is meritorious, and it is scarcely to be argued that it can not be postponed without great injury to the public service. Assuming that at some time most of these appropriations must be made, still it does not argue that they must be in this bill. I take it that there are many public buildings in the bill that could be eliminated without any injury to the public service. I might even go further and say that we could repeal the authorizations with distinct advantage to the public service by not saddling on the Federal Government the care and maintenance of

buildings which are not needed for the transaction of business in that locality.

There is a class of buildings that will be needed in the future and there is a class of buildings under construction now. Those that are under contract are to be appropriated for. A business man will lay aside enough money to meet current obligations, and he will do that first, before he engages in new obligations that he does not have to meet. Before a business man enters into a contract imposing on him additional liabilities he will compute the liabilities, actual and contingent, he is already under and his sources of income that he has to meet them. The American people have a right to demand that kind of business honesty and sagacity from the Members of this House. They have a right to demand that every Member of Congress shall divorce himself from every private, personal, and political interest he may have in the outcome of this legislation—

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. No; I can not; and say, that unless he is satisfied that the money shall be expended in that direction, to the exclusion of others, he will vote for the amendment. I hope the amendment will be seriously considered by the Members of this House.

Mr. DICKINSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. For a very short question.

Mr. DICKINSON. Does this amendment include the proposition for an appropriation for the Kansas City extension?

Mr. BORLAND. That is excluded by the amendment. If this amendment passes, Kansas City extension waits.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, that was a wholesome lecture delivered to the Members of the House by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND]. I regret that the gentleman did not think to deliver it when the river and harbor bill was before the House. The river and harbor bill contained an item for Missouri River for \$200,000, and that made the river and harbor bill a very, very just bill, and one that every Member of the House should vote for.

Mr. BORLAND. I regret that there was no item in it for Cow Creek.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The money that is put into the Missouri River could just as wisely be dumped into Cow Creek, because Cow Creek will carry in the future years as much freight as the Missouri River; it carries now 35,000 tons of freight in a year, the most of it sand that has been taken out of the river, and yet the gentleman from Missouri, whose town has a substantial public building already provided for, comes smugly before the House and says there ought to be no further appropriations of this kind. He says, however, that where buildings have been begun the contract should be continued.

Now, this motion does not include all the buildings now under way and under contract. I know one that is left out of the motion, unintentionally I presume. That is a little building in Chanute, Kans., provided for seven or eight years ago, \$75,000, the balance to complete it. The building is now under way, and it would be a very great hardship not to appropriate the remainder for its completion.

Mr. GILLETT. That was a mistake.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Of course, and I presume it will be put in by unanimous consent, even though no motion was made to Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that Chanute, Kans., for completion, \$42,000, be inserted in the alphabetical list.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object, I would like to know if the gentleman from Kansas will then vote for the amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; I promise to vote against the amendment.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Then I do not object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to insert in the amendment "Chanute, Kans., for completion, \$42,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. I shall object to that. Let the gentleman from Massachusetts amend his own amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. I object.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Did the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] object?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri objects.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, that does not change my position in regard to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] nor with respect to the lecture delivered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND]. I regret to say in closing that he did not deliver that great moral lecture to the House of Representatives when he was getting \$1,200,000 to dump into the Missouri River.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like the privilege of asking the gentleman one question. On page 7 of the bill, in the seventeenth line, there is provision for continuation of the work on the post office at Fulton, Mo., \$30,000 being appropriated. I would inquire of the gentleman whether he has put into his amendment all of the buildings that are under construction, and if he has, how does it happen that language is used there?

Mr. GILLETT. Is that building in the amendment or is it not?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is not in the amendment, but they are digging the foundation for the building at the present time.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that the Treasury Department furnished this statement of all of the buildings which were either under contract or where work was being done upon them. Is the building under contract?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not know whether it is under contract or not. I know they are making experiments in the soil of the lot which was purchased to find out the character of it.

Mr. GILLETT. They do not consider that as being under construction.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then they do not know what they are talking about.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. I will if the gentleman gets the time. I have not the time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID] will be recognized.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Chairman, I am earnestly opposed to the adoption of the amendment. It is my firm conviction the so-called economy urged by its proponents is fallacious. It is plain to everyone that the effect of the adoption of the amendment would be to contribute over the country generally to the already large numbers of unemployed. The number now unable to find employment is deplorably large, and instead of making an effort to find means to add to this, it would be a more humane and sound policy for the Government to follow to find means for finding employment for every worthy unemployed loyal citizen of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is illogical and inconsistent within itself, even from the standpoint of economy and a depleted Treasury. It would strike out all of the one thousand dollar appropriations and leave stand the ten, twenty, thirty, and fifty thousand dollar appropriations. Is this the way to discriminate with a view to keeping money in the Treasury? The proposition is also inconsistent and illogical in that while granting considerable appropriations for the completion of buildings now in course of construction it is so cold-blooded and parsimonious as to forbid a paltry \$1,000 wherewith to commence preparing for a foundation for wholly new structures. The supporters of the amendment absurdly stand for large in preference to small appropriations while proclaiming that they are trying to prevent a deficit in the Treasury. The buildings which have not been commenced and which have been awaiting a start for from two to four years or more are not to be allowed the trifling sum of \$1,000, which will advance their construction one year over what will be realized if the \$1,000 appropriations are not allowed. Talk about economy!

Mr. Chairman, is it not plain that the \$1,000 appropriations will thus save to the Government one year's rental of buildings for post-office purposes and in many cases for both post-office and Federal court purposes? It is well known that these rentals amount to from \$2,000 to \$10,000 or more a year, and that thus the Government would make from 100 to 1,000 per cent or more by making the timely investment of \$1,000 wherewith to commence these public buildings, and thereby save rent for one year.

Mr. Chairman, aside from the considerations I have mentioned is the broader and more enlightened one—I mean the justice that will be brought to the different cities where these public buildings are to be erected, instead of prolonging the delay which has already very reasonably overtaxed the patience of their respective populations.

Mr. Chairman, in both a direct and an indirect sense—from both the individual, the community, and the public national standpoint—it is uneconomical and even losing in dollars and cents to the Government to not accord \$1,000 each wherewith to

commence the buildings named in the bill which are attacked by the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Chairman, I have confidence that the wisdom of the membership of this body by the vote to be expressed will result in the defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER.]

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I will care to use all of the three minutes. I only want time enough to ask a question of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the author of this amendment, in reference to a building on which the contract has already been let. Some time ago I was informed by the Treasury Department that the contract had been awarded for a building. I would like to inquire whether that item would come within this exclusion?

Mr. GILLET. I should think that would undoubtedly be in the amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. No; it is not in the amendment.

Mr. GILLET. Then either the statement that the Treasury Department made to the gentleman or the statement that they made to me is incorrect, and I do not know which.

Mr. FOSTER. The Treasury Department gave me the information some time ago, and I verified it to-day. If the contract has not been let for this building I will be glad to see that item left out of the bill until such time as the Government is better able to construct public buildings. I know the people in the district I represent do not want appropriations at this time wherever it can be avoided.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. The contract could not be let until an appropriation had been made, because that is contrary to law.

Mr. FOSTER. There was an appropriation made last year for the commencement of the building.

Mr. BORLAND. Under that, of course, the contract could have been let to that extent.

Mr. FOSTER. And this amount is for the completion of the building.

Mr. BORLAND. If an isolated case of that kind is discovered, an emergency appropriation can be made.

Mr. FOSTER. I am asking information as to whether or not an amendment of this kind would affect existing contracts? I only want an understanding of the situation—not asking for appropriation.

Mr. BORLAND. It will not.

Mr. FOSTER. Where contracts have been made?

Mr. BORLAND. If there is money due on a contract, the deficiency appropriation bill will carry it.

Mr. FOSTER. The contract has been made, and the appropriation has been made to start the work, though I do not know that any money is due on the contract.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. HULL. I want to inquire of the gentleman how it is possible, in a case where the Treasury Department has let a contract two months ago, for that department now to know whether the work has already been commenced or not?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know. That is what I am trying to find out. I am in favor of eliminating all items where it can be done. If it is an item that affects the district I represent, I am perfectly willing to have it taken out of the bill, and will vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for six minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I have always believed that the Government properly should construct public buildings throughout the country, and that the Government ought to carry on a certain amount of Government construction in various directions—public buildings, river and harbor improvements, and other constructive work properly governmental in character. I have opposed a public-buildings bill, I think, only twice since I have been a Member of the House, once when it carried a large appropriation for the Chicago post office—which it were better had never been expended—and the last time when I merely voted against the bill, which, I think, was passed under suspension of the rules.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN], with his usual style—rather coarse, as it seems to me—said I had not

opposed that bill because I had an item of \$50,000 in it. If it had not been for the statement of the gentleman, I would not make the statement which I am about to make, because I claim no special virtue for myself.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I do not yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. But the gentleman must not misquote me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman refuses to yield.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman is making a misstatement.

Mr. MANN. I am not making a misstatement.

Mr. DONOVAN. Yes; he is.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman, with his usual style, is proceeding, notwithstanding that I decline to yield. The gentleman does not know a misstatement from a correct statement. The difference between the gentleman from Connecticut and myself is that my statements are based upon facts, while his are imaginary. [Laughter.]

After the public-building bill passed two years ago providing for the purchase of a site for a post-office building in my district, which might well be constructed in the interest of the public service—and there can be no criticism of the committee for making the recommendation or including it in the bill—but the trouble came last summer, and the deficit in the Treasury began to be in sight, and I could see how rapidly the sums in the Treasury were retreating, without advertising it, so far as I was concerned, I recommended to the Secretary to reject the bids which had been received and not to purchase sites until the Treasury was in better condition to afford the money. So far as I know—I have not particularly canvassed the subject—but, so far as I know, I met with no disapproval from my constituents, who wanted the public building. They were patriotic; they are patriotic. They could see that we could get along fairly well without the immediate construction of this post-office building. They could see at the same time that the Treasury could not get along fairly well if we concluded to expend these sums of money. Now, that is the same situation all over the country. It is not because these buildings can not be properly constructed, not because they may not be needed that I favor the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, but because it is impossible to pay these appropriations out of the Treasury during the next fiscal year without either borrowing money or increasing the taxes. I doubt very much whether the people desire to have the Government borrow the money for this purpose, and I am quite confident that they do not desire an increase of taxation for these purposes. I appreciate that school of governmental economics who believe that in case of hard times the Government ought to appropriate immense sums of money for public improvements in order to give labor to those who are idle and enable them to obtain employment. There is a little to be said on that side of the question; but if that should be the policy of Congress, this amounts to nothing. This is a mere bagatelle. If we should have a policy of the Government to expend public funds at this time in order to give work to the idle, then we ought to borrow hundreds of millions of dollars and engage in public construction on a gigantic scale, and I think we are not prepared to do that. In the end that probably would be more disastrous than it would be beneficial. Where are you going to get the money? It was only a few months ago that the Treasury had \$125,000,000 balance available for public appropriations. To-day, a day or two ago, it was \$53,000,000; and I did not examine the daily statements which came this morning, and I do not know that I looked at the one of last Saturday, but it has been running down from day to day, and the money that will come in from the income tax will not be sufficient—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to enter into any discussion of the motives of the gentleman from Massachusetts in offering his amendment. I regret to have observed that so brilliant a man and so great a philosopher as the gentleman from Massachusetts is seldom approaches a great question in this House except from an extremely bitter partisan standpoint. But whatever the motive of the gentleman from Massachusetts may be in the motion which he presents, and whatever may be the reasoning with which he attempts to support that motion, the conclusion which he desires to reach is, in my opinion, desirable to be reached, and I shall therefore support the motion. Following a custom which has prevailed through several years in this House, I have from time to time,

as public-building bills have been passed, asked for recognition of certain towns in my district, and they have been recognized.

In the bill of 1910 there was a provision to purchase a site at a town in my district. The site was purchased. This bill carries \$1,000 for the purpose of beginning the work on the building at some indefinite time in the future. It may be temporarily affected if the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts shall prevail; but, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the people there are willing to leave something in business judgment to me to pass upon. Because of the European war, for which this country is not responsible, a condition has come about whereby the revenues of the Government have fallen. Conditions have become such that it is not only desirable, but extremely important as a sound business proposition, that we shall not make any except necessary expenditures. In my opinion an expenditure for ornamental purposes is not, under the conditions which now exist, desirable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And as I understand from the statements of fact which have been made in the course of this argument, the great bulk of the propositions that will be affected by the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts consists of propositions that can not on a business basis be regarded as essential to the conduct of governmental activities. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I take the chances of casting what I consider to be a business vote.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, ordinarily I should be heartily in favor, under existing conditions, of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts. Opinions differ as to the present condition of our finances and as to what the situation will be during the next fiscal year. Whoever forms any opinion upon this question must do so in the light of information available to him. I have myself given considerable study to the public finances and to the probable situation of the Treasury during the next fiscal year. I can not escape the conclusion from the information afforded to me that there will be a deficit in the Treasury in the next fiscal year which will be unquestionably \$30,000,000, and may reach the sum of \$80,000,000 or \$100,000,000. I do not state these figures as mere idle guesses, but I state them as my opinion after a very thorough and exhaustive examination of our probable receipts and expenditures. My opinions are not shared by others in responsibility. Believing, however, that the opinions which I now express are based upon information that is reliable, I was of the opinion that it would be advisable, from the standpoint of good administration, to reduce the probable expenditures of the Federal Government for the next fiscal year below what it is proposed to expend by at least \$50,000,000. That could easily have been done by a radical scaling in the proposed naval program, by the elimination of appropriations for the construction of buildings not yet begun, by the reduction of the appropriations for the maintenance of rivers and harbors to a sum similar to the appropriations for the current year, and by the withholding of appropriations for a number of objects which, although desirable, could readily be deferred until a time when the Treasury would be in better condition to meet the drain upon it.

I was unwilling, however, to ask Members of Congress to refrain from supporting propositions to expend public money to construct public buildings in their respective localities, and to make no attempt in any other direction to curtail the expenses of the Federal Government. And since there has not been any real attempt to curtail the expenditures of the Federal Government in the next fiscal year to such a degree as would eliminate the possibility of a deficit in our revenues, I did not bring myself to agree to support a proposition to eliminate the money proposed for these buildings. I am perfectly frank to say that I did not do it, because I did not believe that the Congress would be in a temper to economize at the expense of public buildings, if other things were not to be touched. The Treasury Department has submitted these estimates with the knowledge of the situation relative to the public finances. It has pressed these items in the belief that the Treasury will not be embarrassed by the appropriation of the money. I am not in accord with that view, but I do not believe that the elimination of these items alone will prevent a very substantial deficit.

Mr. BURNETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURNETT. Is it not a fact that most of these new buildings that are contemplated are the result of authorizations in 1910—

Mr. FITZGERALD. They run through different years.

Mr. BURNETT. And not of 1913?

Mr. FITZGERALD. But perhaps that would be another reason for striking out the authorizations in 1910 and prior years, because I find in the report of the commission created in the last public-building bill a statement that I will read to the committee. The requirement is that the commission shall report as to the desirability, size, accommodation, and cost of the buildings hitherto authorized to the communities in which they are to be located, and also whether existing appropriations shall be increased or diminished to meet such requirements. That commission in their report say:

A general examination of sites and buildings authorized but not consummated has been made and the commission is satisfied that some appropriations and authorizations have been made which are not justified. Other authorizations are too large.

These authorizations were, it is believed, the result of the present unsatisfactory system of providing for and constructing public buildings.

To attempt to make changes in authorizations already made would be to change existing law. Many of the Members of Congress who furnished the facts on which the authorizations were approved are not now in that body. The commission believes, therefore, that it is best to make recommendations as to future appropriations rather than for those already authorized by law.

Therefore the commission recommended that no attempt be made to eliminate the basis existing.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CRISP). Under agreement of the committee all time for debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. GILLET) there were—ayes 40, noes 88.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, EQUIPMENT, AND GENERAL EXPENSES.

Repairs and preservation: For repairs and preservation of all completed and occupied public buildings and the grounds thereof, under the control of the Treasury Department, and for wire partitions and fly screens therefor, Government wharves and piers under the control of the Treasury Department, together with the necessary dredging adjacent thereto, buildings and wharf at Sitka, Alaska, and the Secretary of the Treasury may, in renting said wharf, require that the lessee shall make all necessary repairs thereto, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, in his discretion, to dispose of said wharf and warehouse upon such terms and conditions as may be for the best interests of the United States; for care of vacant sites under the control of the Treasury Department, such as necessary fences, filling dangerous holes, cutting grass and weeds, but not for any permanent improvements thereon; for repairs and preservation of buildings not reserved by vendors on sites under the control of the Treasury Department acquired for public buildings or the enlargement of public buildings, the expenditures on this account for the current fiscal year not to exceed 15 per cent of the annual rentals of such buildings: *Provided*, That of the sum herein appropriated not exceeding \$100,000 may be used for marine hospitals and quarantine stations, including wire partitions and fly screens for same, and not exceeding \$14,000 for the Treasury, Butler, Winder, and Auditors Buildings at Washington, D. C.: *Provided further*, That this sum shall not be available for the payment of personal services except for work done by contract or for temporary job labor under exigency not exceeding at one time the sum of \$100 at any one building. \$750,000.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent to recur to page 9, for the purpose of offering an amendment to strike out the item in line 9:

Humboldt, Tenn., post office: For commencement, \$1,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to recur to page 9 for the purpose of offering an amendment to strike out line 9, providing for the commencement of a post office at Humboldt, Tenn. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I also ask unanimous consent to return to page 16 for the purpose of offering an amendment to strike out lines 8 and 9:

Poughkeepsie, N. Y., post office (extension): For completion, \$40,000.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the request. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to recur to page 16 for the purpose of offering an amendment to strike out lines 8 and 9. Is there objection?

Mr. PLATT. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York objects.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have one more request. I ask unanimous consent to recur to page 16, lines 20 and 21, to strike out the Ridgway, Pa., post office.

Mr. HULINGS. Oh, I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania objects.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The committee will observe that in line 18, on page 22, there is a reference to Government wharves and piers under

the control of the Treasury Department. Then follows a provision for leasing, and so forth. Then appears, beginning with line 23, this provision:

And the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, in his discretion, to dispose of said wharf and warehouse upon such terms and conditions as may be for the best interests of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to conferring upon any executive officer of the United States the power, in his discretion, to dispose of a Government wharf anywhere, but especially one in Alaska. More and more it is being brought home to the shipping interests of the United States that if there is anything for them to remember, and remember all of the time, it is that where a shipping company has absolute control of wharves it can perpetuate one of the most exasperating of monopolies. And more and more the people of the various cities throughout the country have been buying wharves, even at very great expense. New York City was compelled to condemn and purchase wharves and make them public. The city of London was compelled to expend many millions of dollars in condemning and purchasing wharves and making them public. Germany did the same thing at Hamburg. Those who have visited Liverpool know of the magnificent Government docks erected there at great expense. One of the objections made to the improvement of portions of the Mississippi River is that private owners have secured the wharves. Why do they get hold of the wharves? To control the shipping on the river and, if they do not want to engage in shipping themselves, to baffle the efforts of anybody else who may wish to engage in that business.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I will.

Mr. MANN. This proviso is law now; it is in the current law. I do not say whether it is right or wrong, and why it should be covered in here I do not know.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, the Congress has just voted a lot of money for public improvements, railroads, and so forth, in Alaska, which we hope will help to develop that amazingly rich country. The fisheries have not been developed, the mines have not been developed, the forests have not been opened. The bulk of the products is going to be carried in boats when it comes to this country, and the United States Government ought not to sell, nor permit to be sold, the only wharf it has to a steamship company.

The steamship company, if it could get hold of that wharf in Alaska, would have something of an advantage over its rivals and over the Government itself. Public opinion to-day favors the public ownership of at least some wharves when they can be purchased at a reasonable cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOPER. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. Certainly.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I understand that good wharves are very scarce in Alaska. Can the gentleman inform the House how many there are?

Mr. COOPER. I think the gentleman's statement is correct. I remember that it was said during the debate on the railroad bill that good wharves and good harbors in Alaska are not plentiful.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I understood that there are only two or three.

Mr. COOPER. Yes; that are in good harbors. It strikes me, Mr. Chairman, that, having seen the evils of exclusive private ownership of wharves, we ought not to allow Secretary McAdoo to dispose of the Government wharf in Alaska to a steamship company nor to any other private corporation, and therefore I send to the Clerk's desk an amendment to strike out that provision to confer such authority on the Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, line 23, after the word "thereto," strike out all down to and including the word "States," in line 1, page 23.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin has not made so extraordinary a discovery as he imagines. The authority to dispose of the wharf is in the current law. The Treasury Department now has the authority, and although it has not exercised it, it will do it probably before the expiration of the current fiscal year.

There was a very good reason urged for the proposition by the Treasury Department, and the proposition was not to give some private concern an opportunity to get exclusive use of the wharf. The committee couched the authority in such language as would enable the Treasury Department to keep the wharf in public ownership.

The wharf was built in 1845, and we acquired it from the Russian Government at the time Alaska was purchased. The wharf was in very bad condition. It cost about \$5,000 to put it in proper shape. It was impossible to lease it unless it was leased for a period not shorter than 10 years. The city of Sitka, however, asked that the wharf be turned over to it. The city was willing to make the necessary repairs and put the wharf in proper condition, and to permit the vessels of the Government of the United States to use the wharf when they found it necessary to do so.

At one time the Revenue-Cutter Service used the wharf. It was in such bad shape, however, that they abandoned it and used the landing place in the island of Japonski instead. At one time the wharf was leased for as much as \$75 a month, according to my recollection.

This provision was incorporated in the bill last year in order that the Treasury Department might turn this over to the local authorities and put the burden of getting it in proper shape on the city of Sitka, and obtain for the Government of the United States all the possible advantages that could come from the ownership of the wharf by the Government without being subjected to the burden of keeping it in repair.

I do not think it is material whether the provision remains in the bill or not, because the authority now remains in the department, and I have no doubt it will be exercised before the end of the current year.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York does not meet the question. This bill does not declare that the purchaser of this wharf shall be the city of Sitka, nor does it authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to sell to the city of Sitka. It authorizes him to sell to any private corporation to which he may feel inclined to sell this public wharf. We have owned the public wharf since Russia sold it to us in the sixties. Five thousand dollars will put it in repair. I have no doubt that many of the steamship companies would be willing to buy and to put it in repair. The Government to-day owns over 90 per cent of Alaska. We have just voted \$30,000,000 to open up its resources. We spent many days here debating a proposition to authorize the Government to lease certain lands and other properties up there. And yet here is a proposition to authorize the sale outright of a Government wharf in the same Territory. The Secretary, by this provision, is authorized to sell it to any person or corporation. The city of Sitka is not mentioned in the bill, nor is the Secretary limited to the city of Sitka for his vendee.

Public policy to-day demands the retention of wharves which the public owns.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. What can be gained by owning 98 per cent of Alaska and then selling the wharves?

Mr. COOPER. I will repeat the question for the benefit of gentlemen who could not hear. The gentleman from Washington asks what benefit is to be gained when we own 98 per cent of Alaska if we sell our wharf to a private owner. I answer that the benefit will go to the private owner, who will have the wharf that the Government ought to own.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COOPER) there were—ayes 16, noes 14.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OPERATING EXPENSES.

Operating force: For such personal services as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem necessary in connection with the care, maintenance, and repair of all public buildings under the control of the Treasury Department (except as hereinafter provided), together with the grounds thereof and the equipment and furnishings therein, including assistant custodians, janitors, watchmen, laborers, and charwomen; engineers, firemen, elevator conductors, coal passers, electricians, dynamo tenders, lampists, and wiremen; mechanical labor force in connection with said buildings, including carpenters, plumbers, steam fitters, machinists, and painters, but in no case shall the rates of compensation for such mechanical labor force be in excess of the rates current at the time and in the place where such services are employed, \$2,750,000: *Provided*, That the foregoing appropriation shall be available for use in connection with all public buildings under the control of the Treasury Department, including the customhouse at Washington, D. C., but not including any other public building within the District of Columbia, and exclusive of marine hospitals, quarantine stations, mints, branch mints, and assay offices.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows.

Page 29, line 1, after the word "of," insert the words "nor below."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve a point of order.

Mr. MANN. It is not subject to the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think it is legislation.

Mr. MANN. Certainly; it is legislation, but this is legislation in the bill and my amendment perfects it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not think this provision is legislation. I do not think the provision is subject to the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes it is. I did not make it, however, and the Chair will not be called to pass upon that.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MANN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Operating supplies: For fuel, steam, light, water, ice, lighting supplies, electric current for lighting and power purposes, telephone service for custodian forces; removal of ashes and rubbish, snow and ice; cutting grass and weeds, washing towels, and miscellaneous items for the use of the custodian forces in the care and maintenance of completed and occupied public buildings and the grounds thereof under the control of the Treasury Department, and in the care and maintenance of the equipment and furnishing in such buildings; miscellaneous supplies, tools, and appliances required in the operation (not embracing repairs) of the mechanical equipment, including heating, plumbing, hoisting, gas piping, ventilating, vacuum cleaning and refrigerating apparatus, electric-light plants, meters, interior pneumatic-tube and intercommunicating telephone system, conduit wiring, call-bell and signal systems in such buildings (including the customhouse at Washington, D. C., but excluding any other public building under the control of the Treasury Department within the District of Columbia, and excluding also marine hospitals and quarantine stations, mints, branch mints, and assay offices, and personal services, except for work done by contract or for temporary job labor under exigency not exceeding at one time the sum of \$100 at any one building), \$1,625,000. The appropriation made herein for gas shall include the rental and use of gas governors, when ordered by the Secretary of the Treasury in writing: *Provided*, That rentals shall not be paid for such gas governors greater than 35 per cent of the actual value of the gas saved thereby, which saving shall be determined by such tests as the Secretary of the Treasury shall direct.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This item in reference to gas governors has been carried in the bills for quite a while in some form, if I correctly remember, and I have no doubt that there ought to be a provision for gas governors, but since this item went into the bill there have been a great many gas governors invented or used which it is claimed will save half the cost of the gas. They are cheap and are sometimes furnished for almost nothing. Why should we pay to the men who furnish these gas governors on a rental now 35 per cent of the amount of gas that is saved, assuming that these gas governors will save one-half of the gas that they used to consume years ago with the old form of gas light? This looks to me like a pretty ready "cinch" for the fellows who rent the gas governors, if we pay 35 per cent of the amount saved.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This limitation was put in the bill a few years ago when it was found they were paying as high as 50 per cent.

Mr. MANN. I understand. The limitation was a good limitation when it was put in the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There are very few gas governors used. We went into the matter quite fully last year, but I do not remember what was said about it. There are not many used. Electric light is supplanting gas very largely.

Mr. MANN. Nearly everybody who uses gas for lighting purposes now uses some contrivance which aids to save the gas and has more light, and those contrivances are not expensive. The private owner who would save 50 per cent of his gas—they advertise that they save that, and I do not know whether they do or not—and who would then pay 35 per cent of that saving as rent for a gas governor that would not cost one-quarter the amount to purchase would think that he was being robbed. I do not know whether the Government is or not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is the maximum.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether they pay this amount or not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not recall now.

Mr. MANN. Sometimes these things run along without anybody being subject to criticism in the departments or elsewhere.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The matter was gone into quite thoroughly last year, but I do not recall what was said about it.

Mr. MANN. The action of this House in reference to matters which the Government rents has from time to time saved a good deal of money. We used to pay very large sums for renting postage stamp cancellation machines. In the course of time the House restricted the amount of the rent. We restrict the amount that can be paid per gas lamp and all that sort of thing. If we did not, I suppose we would pay more. I do not desire to detain the committee or the gentleman, however. I call it to his attention because if we rent any of these I suspect that

we are paying too high a price for them now. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

COAST GUARD.

For every expenditure requisite for and incident to the authorized work of the Coast Guard, as follows:

For pay and allowances prescribed by law for commissioned officers, warrant officers, petty officers, and other enlisted men, active and retired, not exceeding 21 cadets and cadet engineers who are hereby authorized, and one civilian instructor, \$3,759,600.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I would like to inquire about the 21 cadets and cadet engineers.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That provides for 7 additional to enter in the next year. They have 14 now which are authorized, and this will provide for 7 to go into the class at the beginning of the next year.

Mr. MANN. This is to overcome again that provision which the gentleman inserted a few years ago in the sundry civil appropriation bill that there should be no more cadets?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They say now that they are short, and that they have got to keep educating them.

Mr. MANN. Why not repeal that provision of the law, and we would not have to stick this in every year?

Mr. FITZGERALD. This enables us to keep a little more closely in touch with the number they have.

Mr. MANN. Oh, not at all. The law fixed the number they had before, and that is precisely the number that you are carrying now. You passed a law forbidding them to employ any more without subsequent authorization of Congress, and ever since then you have given the authorization carried in the original law. Of course it is that much more work for the committee and the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Well, they said at that time they would not need any more.

Mr. MANN. I beg the gentleman's pardon—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Nineteen of them.

Mr. MANN. They said they would.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That was the statement of the very excellent gentleman from Chicago at the head of the Treasury Department. I had so much confidence in the statement of gentlemen from Chicago that the committee acceded—

Mr. MANN. There is another gentleman from Chicago who knew more about it than the Secretary of the Treasury, and informed the gentleman on the floor of the House that the statement was not correct, that they could not run the service without having these cadets.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I did not like to take sides in a controversy between the two gentlemen from Chicago.

Mr. MANN. Well, I will withdraw the point of order and I will move to strike out the last word. A few days ago we were entertained, as we always are when the gentleman speaks, and instructed, as we always are when the gentleman speaks, by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] in the consideration of some of the appropriation bills on the subject of lump-sum appropriations. I butted in and advised my friend from North Carolina that when it came to lump-sum appropriations he ought to address his remarks to the Committee on Appropriations. Now, in the military bill that is being criticized, in the Agriculture bill that is being criticized, there are some segregations. The Army bill appropriates for certain classes of officers—so much for officers and for enlisted men so much—and some criticism has been indulged in on the Navy bill, where they did estimate separately for the enlisted men and for the commissioned officers; but here is an item for pay and allowances for commissioned officers, warrant officers, petty officers, and other enlisted men, active and retired officers, \$3,759,600.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is all statutory.

Mr. MANN. So is it statutory in the Navy and in the Army, and so it is statutory in the main in the Agriculture Department.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MANN. But if the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] should bring a military bill in here and say so much for the pay of commissioned officers, warrant officers, petty officers, and other enlisted men, active and retired, \$49,000,000, the Committee on Appropriations would have a cat fit. And yet that is what they do here. Now, no one can tell how much goes to retired officers, no one can tell how much goes to enlisted officers, no one can tell how much goes to the warrant officers, no one can tell how much goes to the commissioned officers. It is the most glaring illustration of the lump-sum appropriations, which could be easily separated, that I have seen for a long time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois has not examined this bill as carefully as usual or he has not been quite as frank in his statement as usual. In the current law and in every sundry civil act prior to this one, appropriations for the Revenue-Cutter Service were all in one single paragraph—one single appropriation. In this bill they are segregated into 12 different items, and they have been segregated with some degree of logic. Under the law the pay of commissioned officers, warrant officers, petty officers, and enlisted men is fixed. It is a matter of computing what the compensation and allowances are and whether they are on the active or retired list, so that we have segregated from other appropriations. The Agricultural bill, which the gentleman from Illinois mentioned, but did not dwell on at any length, had a provision inserted in it, with the gentleman's support, which places the Agricultural Department upon an entirely different footing from any other department of the Government. A few years ago Congress enacted a provision which prohibited any increase in the compensation of persons paid from lump-sum appropriations. A year or two after that law was enacted the Senate put a provision on the Agricultural bill excepting the Agricultural Department from the operations of the law. That department of all others was the most notorious for its violation, or rather for its pursuit, in a practice which was sought to be broken up, and was openly going into the field and inducing the employees of one department of the Government to leave the service of that department and go into the service of the Agricultural Department, holding out the promise of larger compensation out of the lump-sum appropriation, because there is no limitation upon its power to increase compensation; and it is the most lavishly conducted department in the way of indefensible expenditures and manner of compensation of any department of the Government. It has had the help, cooperation, assistance, and protection of the gentleman from Illinois. They say that every man has his weakness, and the weakness of the gentleman from Illinois is his undue favoritism and partiality to the Department of Agriculture, due to the fact that either he himself imagines, or somebody imagines, that he is some sort of an agriculturist or farmer. It is unfortunate for the Government that he has not some other hobby, because if he devoted himself and the same scrutiny and criticism to the Agricultural bill that he does to the other appropriation bills, there would be saved a very considerable sum of money and the Agricultural Department would be a much better department. I am hoping that some germ or microbe or bug some day will get possession of the gentleman from Illinois, so as to divert his interests and activities along other lines than that of an amateur agriculturist, in the interest of the public service.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will yield.

Mr. MOORE. Coming from a peaceful city, far be it from me to break in between two belligerents, the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Chicago—

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would be sorry to disturb the gentleman. I hope he is engaged in that peaceful slumber for which the inhabitants of his city are always noted. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman's very lucid explanation of the lump-sum appropriation which the gentleman from Illinois criticized did arouse me, and I was intensely interested in the explanation of the item as made by the gentleman from New York. It seems to me that everyone who heard the gentleman from New York clearly understands his defense of the item coming in in the way it does. He has told us all about the Agricultural Department and the Agricultural bill, but he has not answered the criticism made by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is no other answer to make, except what I said at the outset, that these are statutory places and compensations, and it is entirely a matter of computation. If we should divide it up into 100 different divisions, it would still reach the same result.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman for clearing away the situation in this lucid manner.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman had not awakened when I first made the statement.

Mr. MOORE. I am aroused now by the gentleman's explanation. I want to inquire, however, merely so that it may show in the Record, whether this appropriation for the Coast Guard includes all appropriations heretofore made for the Revenue-Cutter Service and the Life-Saving Service?

Mr. FITZGERALD. These appropriations are made upon revised estimates prepared since the approval of the Coast Guard bill. When the Coast Guard bill had been enacted the committee had already finished the work of agreeing upon the recommendations for the Life-Saving and Revenue-Cutter Services, so that in making these recommendations it added to the

amount previously decided upon the sum that resulted from mandatory increases as the result of that legislation.

Mr. MOORE. Then there will be no Revenue-Cutter Service appropriations or Life-Saving Service appropriations, but they will all be concentrated under this head of the Coast Guard?

Mr. FITZGERALD. All consolidated under the Coast Guard. Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman from New York yielded the floor?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] referred to me as having criticized the item in the bill. I do not want anybody to take it that I am criticizing the item in the bill. I have simply called attention to certain facts. No one has disputed those facts. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] talked about the Agricultural Department, but did not say anything at all about the Coast Guard Service or the appropriation. Now he says that this item in the bill is only to pay certain statutory compensations, and I accept his statement. The other day we passed a Coast Guard bill. I say "we" passed it. I did the best I could to prevent its being passed, but the noble majority in this House—and I am not speaking of the Democratic side—talked of economy and voted for the bill. I believe we were told at that time that it would cost at the present time in the neighborhood of \$100,000 a year. I said that in my judgment it would cost, to begin with, nearer half a million dollars a year, and how much it would be in the end no one could tell, but probably nearly a million dollars.

Mr. FITZGERALD. In this bill we added—

Mr. MANN. I am making this speech.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I want to give the gentleman some information.

Mr. MANN. I have the information, and will give it to the gentleman if he has not got it.

For the current year, before these services were combined and the Coast Guard bill passed, we appropriated for the maintenance of the Revenue-Cutter Service \$2,350,000, and for the maintenance of the Life-Saving Service \$2,406,700, or a total for the maintenance of the two services of \$4,756,700, and because of the passage of the Coast Guard bill, we have increased the items for the maintenance of the service by \$411,200. The gentleman says that these increases are statutory law, which we have to pay. Well, they were not statutory until very recently to the same amount of appropriations as now. The little Coast Guard bill that we passed the other day, which gentlemen had been begged for from various portions of the country, which they were told would cost the Government only a nominal amount, is already costing the Government, right at the beginning, before it has really gone into effect, as to the retirement features, \$411,200 more for next year than it would have cost if the Coast Guard bill had not passed. Of course there will be a deficiency appropriation for the balance of this year after a while.

Mr. FITZGERALD. To be accurate I want to say for the Record that the mandatory provisions of the Coast Guard bill added \$386,228 to the appropriation. An increase of \$25,000 was due to other causes than to the mandatory provisions of that bill. The \$25,000 would have been added regardless of the passage of that bill.

Mr. MANN. Perhaps so.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; it is not a question of "perhaps," it is a question of fact. In order that the Record may not be criticized I want to state that the mandatory provisions of the Coast Guard bill have increased this appropriation by \$386,228 more than would otherwise have been carried for the two services if the law had not been enacted.

Mr. MANN. That was an act of economy, of course?

Mr. FITZGERALD. And there probably will be estimates for deficiencies for the balance of the current year.

Mr. MANN. I take it there will be.

Mr. FITZGERALD. About \$100,000 for the balance of the current fiscal year.

Mr. MANN. And 10 years from now the two services combined because of the Coast Guard bill will cost the Government at least \$1,000,000 more than if they had not been combined, and that is just a waste of that much money, so far as the Government is concerned. It is a present which the Members of this House, by quite a large majority, made to the constituents of a few of the Members because they begged sufficiently hard. Their constituents ought to know it, because their constituents will pay the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For 12 clerks to district superintendents, at such rate as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine, not to exceed \$900 each, \$10,800.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, a typographical error, in line 7, page 32, in the word "to," will be corrected by the Clerk.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For fuel for vessels, stations, and houses of refuge, \$277,000.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, for the past two days the public press has contained reports that a merchant vessel of one of the belligerent nations went into an English port on Saturday sailing under the American flag. If any protest or criticism of this unwarranted use of our national colors has been made by the Executive or by the Department of State, neither the country nor the Congress has been informed of that fact. In my opinion this is a very serious violation not only of that comity which prevails between civilized nations but as well of the principles of international law, and an incident, if allowed to go without protest, which is likely to lead us into serious international complications.

The circumstance that citizens of the United States were traveling on the boat does not alter the situation in any degree. Persons and residents of the United States in time of war who desire to go to foreign countries and instead of embarking on American ships or upon ships of some neutral country, if they wish to embark upon a boat of any belligerent nation, do so with the full knowledge of all the contingencies and extra hazards that apply to conditions of war.

Dr. Taylor in his American work on international law says:

At sea as on land the use of false colors in war is forbidden. When a vessel is summoned to lie to, or before a gun is fired in action, the national colors should be displayed. And yet it is lawful to use false colors as a ruse, as Nelson did while he lay off Barcelona for a long time showing the French flag, with the object of drawing out the ships of Spain, then allied with France.

It will be observed that the use of another flag by Nelson under these circumstances was upon a battleship, and he used the flag of a belligerent ally for the purpose of deceiving the enemy. And we know that the use of almost any ruse by the navy or army in conflict to the disadvantage of the enemy is permissible. That does not alter the principle to which I am referring.

Calvo, in his work on international law, has this to say:

The flag is the visible sign of the national character of a ship. Each State has its own colors, under which its nationals sail and which can not be used without its permission.

The assumption of a flag of a foreign State without its authorization is considered as a violation of international law, as a device both fraudulent and injurious to the honor of such State. Both the State whose flag is wrongfully used and that in regard to which the use of the false flag is made have the right to demand the punishment of the guilty persons, and, according to circumstances, to punish them themselves.

I think it will appear upon the most casual consideration that a failure to protest against the unwarranted use of the national colors in this way is a tacit consent to their use. It must be so interpreted by the other belligerent powers and as a practical favoritism to the nation whose citizens undertake to deceive the enemy by the use of the flag of a neutral power.

If Great Britain could assume the flag of the American merchant marine for her craft, the merchant marine of any other country could do the same; and if the belligerent countries can fly the American colors over their vessels, the neutral powers can do the same, and our flag would become an object of disrespect throughout the world.

If we allow the merchant marine of belligerent countries to fly our flag to deceive their enemies, it will soon cease to afford protection to American citizens and to the American merchant marine. When the American flag floats over a ship at sea it should mean that the ship, its passengers, and cargo will be protected to the last limit of American power.

I believe that Congress in this short session should pass an act prohibiting the use of the American colors on any but American vessels and making it an offense for the master of any foreign vessel, whether of a belligerent or a peaceful nation, to fly the American flag over a foreign ship. Severe penalties for the violation of the statute should be provided, including the confiscation of the boat as well as punishment of the commander whenever the ship may return to an American jurisdiction.

I can not see how the Nation can protect the dignity and honor of its flag unless it does something of that kind. The American flag is the insignia of American sovereignty, and its use by any other nation without our consent is unwarranted and ought to bring from Congress some action on the subject. In my opinion, if the President of the United States and his Cabinet will cease blocking legislation for the balance of this session with the impossible shipping bill, which is liable to draw us into serious complications—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. I ask for one minute more.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I object.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that no quorum is present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota makes the point that no quorum is present. The Chair will count.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of no quorum. I only ask for one minute.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will not object to one minute.

Mr. MARTIN. I only desire to conclude the sentence that I had started upon. If instead of clogging the passage of necessary appropriation bills through Congress the captain of the team would organize for some teamwork upon a patriotic measure of this kind which would place before the world in a proper light the respect of American citizenship for American colors, he would be conferring a service upon the country.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENGRAVING AND PRINTING.

For the work of engraving and printing, exclusive of repay work, during the fiscal year 1916, of not exceeding 74,000,000 delivered sheets of United States notes, 13,500,000 delivered sheets of national bank notes and Federal reserve currency, 90,000,000 delivered sheets of internal-revenue stamps, 8,000,000 delivered sheets of emergency-revenue stamps, 200,000 delivered sheets of customs stamps, 4,225,000 delivered sheets of opium orders and special tax stamps required under act of December 7, 1914, and 1,600,500 delivered sheets of checks, drafts, and miscellaneous work, as follows.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. I wanted to find out the object of limiting the amount of sheets that can be printed under this paragraph. Why is that done?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the number of sheets of various kinds are incorporated in the bill in order to enable the committee to keep some track of what is done in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. For the last few years, ever since an attempt has been made to ascertain just what was being done, the absolute inability to reconcile the figures of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing with the figures of the United States Treasurer's office has been such that it has been impossible to work with any intelligence. We have now given them enough money to enable the bureau to deliver a certain number of sheets of various kinds. That puts the work upon a logical and proper basis.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that provide for printing all that is estimated for for the coming year?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; it does not; not all that was asked, because there is always a difference of opinion between the committee and the department as to just how much work should be done. This provides for as much work as was authorized for the current year, and in addition emergency currency, amounting to \$500,000,000, was thrown open to the extent of over \$200,000,000, and the balance of two hundred and odd million dollars gives an additional reserve which heretofore had not been counted, so that the committee believed that for the present, in view of present conditions, this number of sheets of the various kinds will be sufficient.

Mr. FOSTER. Will it supply all that is necessary for the coming year?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That was the opinion of the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. But under this provision the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing could not print more than that number?

Mr. FITZGERALD. He can not deliver more than that number. It says "deliver," because 5 per cent is usually allowed for wastage. They spoil about 5 per cent of the sheets in the work.

Mr. FOSTER. And the gentleman thinks that furnishes all that is necessary?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think it furnishes all that is necessary for the proper conduct of the Government. It may be that later on it will be determined that additional revenue stamps may be needed, and if they are the committee will be ready to provide for the appropriation to furnish them. There is a continual controversy as to the amount of new United States notes that ought to be issued.

Mr. FOSTER. And this is simply to find out what is done each year instead of going on in that way without knowing?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Without having any basis on which to work, except figures that are never to be reconciled.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I understand that this is a limitation on the amount of work that can be done, and it is nothing further than that?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is all.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice here in line 18, on page 33, reference is made to 74,000,000 delivered sheets of United States "notes." On page 38 reference is made to 73,500,000 sheets of United States "securities."

Mr. FOSTER. Would not those be the gold notes and the greenbacks?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no; these are for United States notes—gold and silver certificates.

Mr. MANN. Why do you call them notes in one place and securities in the other? It refers to the same thing.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What was the other page?

Mr. MANN. Page 38, lines 5 and 6.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman will notice it says "for distinctive paper for United States securities, not less than 73,500,000 sheets."

Mr. MANN. Yes; but on page 33 it says 74,000,000 sheets of United States notes. The context of the bill shows that this reference is to the same thing. In one place it is called "securities" and in the other "notes," just as in one place reference is made to Federal reserve bank currency and in another case Federal reserve currency. On page 33 it is called "Federal reserve currency" and on page 38 it is called "Federal reserve bank currency." I suppose the latter is the correct form, but it ought to be the same in both places, I think.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Under this title, "Distinctive paper for United States securities," my recollection is that sometimes paper is for other forms of securities and notes, for instance, bonds, so that the word "securities" would be used.

Mr. MANN. I understand; but in the other place, when you provide for 74,000,000 sheets of notes and then authorize 73,500,000 altogether for securities, including notes, it is very evident that you are not providing for many other things except notes, because you are shy a half million sheets. That might easily have been made up in different places, but it is perfectly plain that means the same thing, and it certainly does.

I think the gentleman ought to have time to examine that, and it seems to me, inasmuch as we have been running now for seven hours, and we do not know how long we will run tomorrow, that the gentleman ought to move to rise.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, as the House was not notified that I would ask it to stay to-night, I will move to rise now, but I give notice now that I will ask the House to stay to-morrow night. First, however, Mr. Chairman, I ask to have the amendment which I offered submitted.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34, line 1, strike out the word "seventh" and insert the word "seventeenth."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CRISP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 21318, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. WALTERS. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. WALTERS. To ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentlemen? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 19424. An act to extend the time for the completion of the municipal bridge at St. Louis, Mo.

JUDGE ALSTON G. DAYTON.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Judiciary Committee, I desire to present a report (No. 1381) on House resolu-

tion 541 in reference to an investigation of the alleged official misconduct of Judge Alston G. Dayton. I ask that it be printed, and I will call up the report probably to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Report on House resolution 541, directing the Committee on the Judiciary to inquire and report whether the action of the House is necessary concerning the alleged official misconduct of Alston G. Dayton.

The SPEAKER. Ordered printed and referred to the House Calendar.

HOOR OF MEETING.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, did I understand the gentleman to say that he intended to ask the House to remain in session right along to-morrow until what time?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, until 10 or half past 10.

Mr. MANN. Without taking a recess for dinner?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, yes.

Mr. MANN. If we are going to do that—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask, in order to expedite this bill, that by unanimous consent we agree that this bill shall have the right of way next Calendar Wednesday, and suggest to the gentleman that he ask for unanimous consent to meet at 11 o'clock on both days. Pending the request of the gentleman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with next Calendar Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama, pending the request of the gentleman from New York, asks unanimous consent that we dispense with the business in order on next Calendar Wednesday. Is there objection?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what committee has the call on Wednesday?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and they are not adverse to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the hour of meeting for the rest of this week, providing the sundry civil bill is under consideration, be fixed at 11 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that during the rest of this week the House meet at 11 o'clock a. m., providing the sundry civil bill continues that long. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LINCOLN MEMORIAL.

The Chair has been requested to state to the House that the Lincoln Memorial Commission wants the signatures of all the Members of this House to be put in the corner stone which is to be laid on next Friday, and in order to do that they have fixed parchment sheets with a kind of ink that they say will never fade and a special pen, and the Chair is going to have them put on a table in the lobby so everybody can sign it. They want the Kentucky delegation to sign in a body and the Illinois delegation to do the same thing.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet at 11 a. m. to-morrow, Tuesday, February 9, 1915.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$5,000 for protection and improvement of Glacier National Park, Mont. (H. Doc. No. 1576); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting schedules of claims amounting to \$650,373.04 allowed by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department under appropriations, the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (H. Doc. No. 1579); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims amounting to \$29,159.08 which have been presented to this department and require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 1577); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Navy of the 1st instant reporting that the Navy Department has considered, ascertained, adjusted, and determined that the sum of \$140.25 is due the owners of the German ship *Indra* for damages for which a vessel of the Navy was found to be responsible (H. Doc. No. 1578); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting estimates of appropriations for rent of buildings for use of Government officials at Boise, Idaho; Charlotte, N. C.; Concord, N. H.; Harrisburg, Pa.; Lincoln, Nebr.; Madison, Wis.; Newport, R. I.; Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Reading, Pa.; Sandusky, Ohio; Toledo, Ohio; and Mount Clemens, Mich. (H. Doc. No. 1580); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting a communication from the Attorney General, of February 6, 1915, submitting a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims in favor of claimants in Indian depredations cases, amounting to \$6,279, which require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 1581); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War, of the 6th instant, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for transportation of troops and equipment to and from the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, for preparing camp sites, construction of buildings, installation of water system, oiling of roads, etc., to be immediately available and to remain available until the end of the fiscal year 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1582); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

8. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting copy of a communication of the commissioner, United States Board of Mediation and Conciliation, submitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for expenses of the board for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 1583); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

9. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$292,000 for the enforcement of the provisions of the act of December 17, 1914, entitled "An act to provide for the registration of, with collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or cocoa leaves, their salts, derivatives, and preparations, and for other purposes (H. Doc. No. 1584); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

10. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of judgments rendered against the Government by the district courts of the United States as submitted by the Attorney General and which require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 1585); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GILMORE, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18310) to acquire a site for a public building at Hartford, Conn., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1375), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SINNOTT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 2223) to authorize the use of the revenues in the Crater Lake National Park in the management of the same, and the construction, repair, and improvement of roads, trails, and bridges in the park, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1376), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Ways and Means was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19828) for the relief of the Longini Mexican Hat Co., of San Antonio, Tex., and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 21357) to prohibit gambling in foodstuffs; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 21358) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Bisbee, Cochise County, Ariz.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 21359) granting the consent of Congress to the Citizens' Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Burlington, Iowa; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CALLAWAY: A bill (H. R. 21360) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Fort Worth, Tex., and for the remodeling, altering, etc., of the present post-office building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 21377) to encourage the reclamation of certain arid lands in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 21378) to provide for the establishment of a bureau of Government architecture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 21379) to amend section 5 of the motor-boat law passed June 9, 1910; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAINEY: Resolution (H. Res. 726) for the relief of Nellie M. Murdock; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GREGG: Resolution (H. Res. 727) to amend House resolution 532, Sixty-third Congress, second session; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relating to the placing of an embargo on the exportation of agricultural products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOBECK: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to the control of the waters in the streams between Nebraska and Colorado and between Nebraska and Wyoming; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POU: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, to dispense with the requirement of the oath of loyalty to the Union during the late war between the States from those holding claims against the United States and wishing to prosecute them; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, protesting against an embargo on agricultural products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon, urging Congress to enact a rural-credit law under which farmers may obtain long-term loans at a reasonable rate of interest; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon, praying for the enactment of a law granting pensions to the veterans of the Modoc and other Indian wars in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon, requesting Congress to immediately appropriate the sum of \$300,000 to be used by the United States Department of Agriculture for the destruction of coyotes, wolves, wildcats, cougars, and bears on the western public lands; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee: Memorial from the General Assembly of Tennessee, touching appropriation by the Federal Government for the purpose of constructing roads; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. CURRY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, petitioning Congress to place veterans of the United States Army who fought in the Indian wars from 1865 to 1891 on the pension roll; to the Committee on Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 21361) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 21362) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Force; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 21363) for the relief of Alfred E. Lewis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 21364) granting an increase of pension to John J. Stanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 21365) granting an increase of pension to Elender Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 21366) granting a pension to Henry B. Gabbard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21367) granting a pension to William Sally; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21368) granting an increase of pension to Manerva Inland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 21369) granting a pension to Maria J. Lantry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 21370) granting a pension to Charles M. Reece; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21371) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Chrissinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN: A bill (H. R. 21372) granting an increase of pension to Frank A. Pennington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 21373) granting a pension to Orinda Sarah Foust; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21374) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hudson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 21375) for the relief of Rittenhouse Moore, receiver of the Mobile Marine Dock Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHALEY: A bill (H. R. 21376) granting a pension to Bunell L. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of sundry citizens of Augusta, Mo., urging passage of House joint resolution 377, relative to export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of sundry citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of Germania Quartette Club, of Johnstown, Pa., protesting against bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Paul Schmidt, Frank Deiboldt, B. J. Egersten, L. P. Shelly, G. A. Utecht, Fred Sann, Otto Jacobs, Fred Rolling, William Buck, Phil Benke, Louis Nau, William Bocke, L. A. Geis, F. W. Pearman, Robert Steigelman, William Schrader, John Lipp, and Max Scheckelman, all of Johnstown, Pa., favoring legislation prohibiting exportation of arms, etc., to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BEAKES: Petition of Thomas Kilpatrick and 49 citizens of Jackson, Mich., favoring prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of H. W. Haller and 24 citizens of Ann Arbor; Thomas Voigt and 54 citizens of Carleton; and the German Aid Society, of South Haven, all in the State of Michigan, protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Resolutions adopted by the Germania Verein, No. 13, G. W. G. G., of Sheboygan, Wis., with a membership of 256 citizens, asking for the passage of a law at this session of Congress to levy an embargo on all contraband of war, save foodstuffs alone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition signed by William Mueller and 94 other citizens of the vicinity of Freistadt, Ozaukee County, Wis., asking for the passage of House joint resolution 377 at this session of Congress, to levy an embargo upon all contraband of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COPLEY: Memorial of Elgin Commercial Club, urging passage of the Hamill bill, H. R. 5139; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, memorial of St. Michael's Court, No. 1366, Catholic Order of Foresters, of Aurora, Ill., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of Elmer E. Hubbard, of Cardenas, Cuba, favoring federation of nations, first on the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Claus Hertmann, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring passage of resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of New Jersey, favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Branch No. 60, Lutheran Aid Association, Ableman, Wis., favoring bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINLEY: Petitions of citizens of Nassau County, N. Y.; Jersey City, N. J.; Elizabeth, N. J.; and Brooklyn, N. Y., against any legislation abridging the freedom of the press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee: Memorial of Woman's Missionary Society of Methodist Episcopal Church of Union City and Woman's Missionary Society of Martin, Tenn., protesting against practice of polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Memorial of church council and members of the St. Michaels and Zion's Lutheran Church, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring passage of resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Hess-Bright Manufacturing Co., Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against bill to prevent the Government issuing stamped envelopes with return request; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of American Association for Labor Legislation, favoring passage of the Kern-McGillcuddy workmen's compensation bill (H. R. 15222); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: Petitions of Charles E. Parsons and others of the first congressional district of Vermont, protesting against curtailment of Rural Free Delivery Service for the contract system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of citizens of St. Cloud, Minn., favoring passage of the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LOBECK: Petition of 47 citizens of Benson, Nebr., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Communication of Austrian Singing Society, New Britain, Conn., in re House joint resolutions 377 and 378, Senate bill 6688, and House bill 19548; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of 45 citizens of Kingston, N. Y., favoring bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 80 citizens of Columbia County, N. Y., urging world federation for peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of Harry B. Anderson, Chicago, Ill., for establishment of a national university; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of 85 citizens of Grand Haven, Mich., and citizens of Ionia, Mich., favoring embargo on export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of Loyal Court No. 3, Guardians of Liberty, of Lead, S. Dak., and sundry citizens of Bellefourche, S. Dak., protesting against passage of House bill 20644 and House bill 20780, to amend the postal law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOORE: Letters from George Von Bosse, Joseph Klar, Robert Kuehne, and others, of Philadelphia, Pa., urging legislation to prohibit the sale and exportation of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Civic and Commerce Association of Eau Claire, Wis., favoring House bill 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Protest of Carl Erlene and 220 citizens of Kalamazoo; Charles Riedel, of Van Buren; James Ellick, of Galesburg; A. David, of Lawton; Lucian Finley, of Oshtemo; Ed. Williams, of Williams, all in the State of Michigan, against Senate bill 6865; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of 26 citizens of Highland, Minn., favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THACHER: Petition of National Independent Equal Rights League, protesting against jim-crow cars in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petition of 1,386 American citizens, favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.